Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.
DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE
DISTINCTIO IX.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 176-179.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Cap. I.

De distinctione trium personarum.

Nunc ad distinctionem trium personarum accedamus. « Teneamus igitur, ut docet Augustinus in libro de Fide ad Petrum,[1] Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum unum esse Deum naturaliter, nec tamen ipsum Patrem esse qui Filius est, nec Filium esse ipsum qui Pater est, nec Spiritum sanctum esse ipsum qui Pater est aut Filius. Una enim est essentia Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, in qua non est aliud Pater, aliud Filius, aliud Spiritus sanctus, quamvis personaliter alius sit Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus sanctus ».[2]

Cap. II.

De coaeternitate Patris et Filii.

Genitus est enim a Patre Filius, et ideo alius, nec tamen ante fuit Pater quam Filius; coaeternae enim sibi sunt tres personae. Sed contra hoc inquit haereticus, ut refert Ambrosius in libro primo de Trinitate:[3] « Omne quod natum est, principium habet; et ideo, quia Filius est, principium habet et esse coepit; quod haereticorum ore sic

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES
ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD
DISTINCTION 9

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 176-179.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Chapter I

On the distinction of the Three Persons.

Now let us proceed [accedamus] to the distinction of the Three Persons. « We are bound, therefore, » as (St.) Augustine teaches in the book On the Faith to Peter,[1] « that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the One God naturally, nor, however, that the Father Himself is He who the Son is, nor that the Son is He Himself who the Father is, nor that the Holy Spirit is He Himself who the Father is, or the Son. For one [una] is the Essence of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in which one thing [aliud] is not the Father, another thing the Son, another thing the Holy Spirit, although personally One [alius] is the Father, another One the Son, another One the Holy Spirit ».[2]

Chapter II

On the coeternity of the Father and of the Son.

For begotten by [a] the Father is the Son, and for that reason Another, nor, however, was the Father before [ante quam] the Son; for coeternal to Themselves are the Three Persons. But against this the heretic says, as (St.) Ambrose reports in his first book On the Trinity:[3] « Everything which is born, has principle; and for that reason, because He

dictum est ». « Nam ipse Arius, ut meminit Augustinus in sexto libro de Trinitate,[4] dixisse fertur: Si Filius est, natus est; si natus est, erat, quando non erat Filius ».

is the Son, He has a beginning and undertook to be; which by the mouth of heretics is said in this manner ». « For Arius himself, as (St.) Augustine remembered in his sixth book On the Trinity,[4] is reported to have said: If He is the Son, He has been born; if He has been born, there was (a time), when the Son was not ».

Qui hoc dicit « non intelligit, etiam *natum esse de Deo* sempiternum esse, ut sit coaeternus Patri Filius, sicut splendor, qui gignitur ab igne atque diffunditur, coaevus est illi, et esset coaeternus, si ignis est aeternus ».[5]

Who says this « does not understand, even *that to have been born of* [de] *God* is to be sempiternal, so that coeternal to the Father [Patri] is the Son, just as the splendor, which is begotten by [a] fire and is diffused (with it), is co-eval to it, and would be coeternal, if the fire is eternal ».[5]

Item: « Si Dei Filius, inquit Augustinus, virtus et sapientia Dei est, nec unquam fuit Deus sine virtute et sapientia, coaeternus est Deo Patri Filius. Dicit autem Apostolus:[6] *Christum esse Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam*; aut ergo non fuit, quando non fuit Filius, aut aliquando Deus non habuit virtutem et sapientiam, quod dementis est dicere ». Constat enim, quia semper habuit sapientiam, semper ergo habuit Filium.

Likewise: « If the Son of God », says (St.) Augustine, « is the Virtue and Wisdom of God, and God was not ever without virtue and wisdom, (then) coeternal to the God the Father is the Son. Moreover the Apostles says:[6] that *Christ is the Virtue of God and the Wisdom of God*; therefore, either there was not a, when there was not a Son, or at sometime God did not have virtue and wisdom, which belongs to the demented to say ». For it is established, that He always had wisdom, therefore He always had the Son.

Eidem quoque Arianicae quaestioni Ambrosius[7] in hunc modum respondet: « Ego, inquam, Filium esse natum confiteor; quod reliquum est impietatis hor- / -resco ».

To the same question of Arius (St.) Ambrose[7] also responds in this manner: « I, I say, that the Son has been born do confess; because the rest belongs to impiety I am / horrified ».

---

[1] Cap. 1. n. 5. — In principio distinctionis omnes codd. omittunt *trium*.
[2] Vat. huic capitulo addit verba seqentis cap. *Genitus est* usque *alius*.
[3] Cap. 11. n. 73. — Solummodo Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 8 citant hunc librum sub nomine *de Fide ad Gratianum*; cfr. supra Dis. II. c. 4. In textu contra originale et codd. nostros Vat. cum ceteris edd. post *Filius* addit *natus*.
[4] Cap. 1. n. 1, unde et duae auctoritates, quae sequuntur, sumtae sunt. In primo textu solummodo Vat. et edd. 4, 6 cum originali Augustini ante *quando* addunt *tempus*. Sed notum adagium Arii est: Erat quando non erat (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□).
[5] Sola Vat. perperam omittit *aeternus*.
[6] I. Cor. 1, 24; sed in Vulgata et Augustino deest *esse*. Paulo ante post *coaeternus* Vat. et edd. 4, 9 addunt *ergo*.
[7] Loc. cit. — Ex eodem libro c. 8. n. 55 proximus

---

[1] Chapter 1, n. 5. — In the beginning of the distinction all the codices omit *three* [trium].
[2] The Vatican text adds to this chapter the words of the following chapter, *For begotten* [Genitus est enim] upto *another* [alius]. [3] Chapter 11, n. 73. — Only the Vatican text and editions 4, 6 and 8 cite this book under the name On the Faith to Gratian; cf. above D. II, ch. 4. In the text, contrary to the ordinal and our codices, the Vatican text with the rest of the editions read *If He was born the Son* [Si Filius natus est].
[4] Chapter 1, n. 1, whence also the two quotes, which follow, are taken. In the first text only the Vatican text and edition 4 and 6, together with the original of (St.) Augustine, add *time* [tempus] before *when* [quando]. But the noted adage of Arius is: There was a, when He was not (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□).
[5] The Vatican text alone, wrongly, omits *eternal* [aeternus].

huius capituli locus sumtus est, secundus et tertius ex c. 9. n. 58. et 59, quartus ex eodem cap. n. 60.

[6] 1 Cor. 1:24; but in the Vulgate and (St.) Augustine there is lacking the *is* [esse]. A little before this at *coeternal* [coaeternus] the Vatican text and editions 4 and 9 add *therefore* [ergo].
[7] Loc. cit. — From the same book ch. 8, n. 55, the next passage is taken from this chapter, the second and third from ch. 9, n. 58 and 59, the fourth from the same chapter n. 60.

hor- / -resco ». « Scriptum est enim in veteri Testamento,[1] ut vel unum e pluribus dicam: *Ante me non fuit alius Deus, et post me non erit*. Quis ergo hoc dicit? Pater an Filius? Si Filius, *ante me*, inquit, *non erit*: hic priorem, ille posteriorem non habet. Invicem enim in se et Pater in Filio, et Filius in Patre cognoscitur.[2] Cum enim Patrem dixeris, eius etiam Filium designasti, quia nemo ipse sibi pater est; cum Filium nominas, etiam Patrem fateris, quia nemo ipse sibi filius est. Itaque nec Filius sine Patre, nec Pater potest esse sine Filio: semper igitur Patre, semper et Filius est ».

I am / horrified ». « For it was written in the Old Testament,[1] to speak even of one of many (passages): *Before Me there was no other God, and after Me there shall not be (another)*. Who therefore says this? The Father, or the Son? If the Son, *before Me*, He says, *there shall not be (another)*: this (has not) one before, the that has not one after. For mutually in Themselves, both the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father are cognized.[2] For when you say *the Father*, you have also designated His Son, because no one is a father to himself; when you name the Son, you also say [fateris] the Father, because no one is a son to himself. And so neither can the Son be without the Father, nor the Father without the Son: therefore Father (is) always, and the Son is always ».

Item: « Dic, inquam, mihi haeretice, fuitne, quando omnipotens Deus Pater non erat, et Deus erat? Nam si Pater esse coepit, Deus ergo primo erat et postea Pater factus est. Quomodo ergo immutabilis Deus est? Si enim ante Deus, postea Pater fuit, utique generationis accessione mutatus est ». « Sed avertat Deus hanc amentiam ».[3]

Likewise: « Tell me, I say, (you) heretic, was there a, when God the Father omnipotent was not, and God was? For if the Father undertook to be, therefore first there was God and afterwards the Father was made. In what manner, therefore, is God immutable? For if before there was God, afterwards the Father, He has indeed been changed by an accession of generation ». « But may God turn (us) from such mindlessness! »[3]

Cap. III.

De ineffabili et intelligibili generationis modo.

« Sed quaeris a me, inquit Ambrosius,[4] quomodo, si Filius sit, non priorem habeat Patrem? Quaero item abs te, quando vel quomodo Filium putes esse generatum? Mihi enim impossibile est generationis scire

Chapter III

On the ineffable and intelligible manner of the generation.

« But you seek from me », says (St.) Ambrose,[4] « how, if He is the Son, does He not have a prior Father? I seek, likewise, from you, when and/or in what manner do you think the Son has been begotten? For to

secretum. Mens deficit, vox silet, non mea tantum, sed et Angelorum; supra potestates et supra Angelos et supra Cherubim et supra Seraphim et supra omnem sensum est, quia scriptum est:[5] *Pax Christi supra omnem sensum est*. Et si pax Christi supra omnem sensum est, quomodo non est supra omnem sensum tanta generatio? » « Tu ergo *ori manum advove*; scrutari non licet superna mysteria. Licet scire, quod natus sit, non licet discutere, quomodo natus sit. Illud negare mihi non licet, hoc quaerere metus est ». Ineffabilis enim est illa generatio; unde Isaias:[6] *Generationem eius quis enarrabit?*

me it is impossible to know the secret of (that) generation. The mind fails, the voice is silent: not mine only, but even (those) of the Angels; it is above the powers (of man) and above Angels, and above the Cherubim and above the Seraphim and above every sense, because it has been written:[5] *The peace of Christ is above every sense*. And if the peace of Christ is above every sense, in what manner is so great a generation not above every sense? » « You, therefore, *put your hand upon your mouth*; it is not licit to scrutinize the supernal mysteries. It is licit to know [scire], that He has been born, it is not licit to discuss, in what manner He has been born. The former is not licit for me to deny, the latter I have feared to question ». For ineffable is that generation; whence Isaiah (says):[6] *His generation, who shall tell it forth?*

Quidam tamen de ingenio suo praesumentes dicunt, illam generationem posse intelligi et alia huiusmodi, inhaerentes illi auctoritati Hieronymi super Ecclesiasten:[7] « In sacris Scripturis *quis* saepissime non pro impossibili, sed pro difficili ponitur, ut ibi: *Generationem eius quis enarrabit?* » Sed hoc non dixit[8] Hieronymus ideo, quod generatio Filii aeterna *plene* intelligi vel explicari possit a quoquam mortalium, sed quia de ea *aliquid* intelligi vel dici potest. Quidam tamen hoc accipiunt dictum de temporali Christi generatione.

Certain ones, however, presuming from their own ingenuity say, that that generation can be understood and other (things) of this kind, adhering [inhaerentes] to that quote of (St.) Jerome on Ecclesiastes:[7] « In the Sacred Scriptures *who* most often is not posited for the impossible, but for the difficult, as there (where it says): *His generation who can tell it forth?* » But by this (St.) Jerome did not say,[8] for this reason [ideo], that the eternal generation of the Son can be *fully* understood and/or explained by any of mortals, but that of it [de ea] *something* can be understood and/or said. Certain ones, however, accept this saying of the temporal generation of Christ.

Cap. IV.

Utrum debeat dici: semper gignitur Deus, vel semper genitus est.

Chapter IV

Whether there ought to be said: God always is begotten, and/or always has been begotten.

Hic quaeri potest, cum generatio Filii a Patre nec principium habeat nec finem, quia aeterna est, utrum debeat dicit: Filius semper gignitur, vel semper genitus est, vel semper gignetur. De hoc Gregorius super Iob[9] ait: « Dominus Deus Iesus in eo, quod virtus et sapientia Dei est, de Patre ante

Here it can be asked, since the generation of the Son by [a] the Father has neither a beginning nor an end, because it is eternal, whether there ought to be said: the Son is always begotten, and/or always has been begotten, and/or always will be begotten. Concerning this (St.) Gregory on Job[9] says: «

tempora natus est, vel potius, quia nec coepit nasci nec desiit, dicamus verius *semper natus*; non autem possumus dicere *semper nascitur*, ne imperfectus esse videatur. At vero, ut aeternus designari valeat et perfectus, *semper* dicamus et *natus*, quatenus et *natus* ad perfectionem pertineat et *semper* ad aeternitatem; quamvis per hoc ipsum, quod *perfectum* dicimus, multum ab illius veritatis expressione deviamus, quia quod *factum* non est, non potest dici proprie *perfectum* »; sed balbutiendo, ut possumus, excelsa Dei resonamus. « Et Dominus, nostrae infirmitatis verbis condescendens, *Estote*, inquit, *perfecti, sicut et Pater vester caelestis perfectus est* »[10] Super illum locum etiam Psalmi: *Ego hodie genui te,* de hac generatione Filii ita loquitur Augustinus:[11] «Quamquam per hoc, quod dicit *hodie*, possit etiam intelligi dies ille, quo Christus secundum hominem natus est; tamen quia *hodie* praesentiam significat, atque in aeternitate neque praeteritum quidquam est, quasi esse desierit, neque futurum, quasi nondum sit, sed praesens tantum, quia quidquid aeternum est, semper est; divinius tamen accipitur de sempiterna generatione sapientiae Dei ».[12] Ecce, his verbis ostendit Augustinus, quod generatio Filii semper est nec praeterit nec futura est, quia aeterna est. Ideo enim[13] dixit *genui*, ne novum putaretur, scilicet ne videretur incepisse; *hodie* dixit, ne praeterita generatio videretur. « Ex his ergo verbis Prophetae, ut ait Ioannes Chrysostomus,[14] nihil aliud manifestatur, nisi quia ex ipsa essentia Patris semper genitus est Filius ».

The Lord God, Jesus, in this, that He is the Virtue and the Wisdom of God, has been born of [de] the Father before (all) times, and/or rather, because He neither undertook to be born nor failed (to be), let us say more truly *always born*; moreover we cannot say *always is born*, lest He seem to be imperfect. But, on the other hand [vero], that He prevail to be designated as eternal and perfect, let us say *always* and *born*, to the extent that both *born* pertains to perfection and *always* to eternity; although through this very (thing), because we call (Him) the *perfectum*, we deviate much from the expression of that truth, because what is not *made* [factum], cannot properly said to be a *perfectum* »; but by stuttering, as we can, we echo the highest (things) of God. « And the Lord, condescending to our infirmity in words, said, *Be perfect, just as your heavenly Father is perfect* »[10] Also, on this passage of the Psalm: *I today have begotten Thee*, (St.) Augustine speaks thus of this generation:[11] « And yet [quamquam], through this, that he says, *today*, there can also be understood that day, in which Christ according to man was begotten; however because *today* signifies things being present [praesentia], and (because) in eternity there is nothing past, as if it had failed [desierit] to be, nor a future, as if it were not yet, but only a present [praesens], because whatever is eternal, always is; it is more divinely accepted of the sempiternal generation of the Wisdom of God ».[12] Behold, with these words (St.) Augustine shows, that the generation of the Son always is, and (that) it is not past, nor is it future, because it is eternal. For[13] for this reason [ideo] he said *I have begotten*, lest He be reputed new, that is, lest He seem to have commenced [incepisse]: he said *today*, lest the generation seem past. « From these words, therefore, of the Prophet », as (St.) John Chrysostom says,[14] « nothing other is manifested, except that from the Essence Itself of the Father the Son has always been begotten ».

---

[1] Isai. 43, 10. [Tr. — In ed. critic. subito ante *Scriptum* deficit «.] [2] Respicitur illud Ioan. 14, 9. et 10. — Paulo supra post *priorem* Vat contra orginale, codd. et edd. 1, 8 adiicit *et*.
[3] Codd. C E et A (in margine) cum edd. 1, 8 hic

---

[1] Isaiah 43:10. [Tr. Note: In the critical edition, there was lacking a », which is corrected here.]
[2] A reference to John 14:9,10. — A little above this after *one before* [priorem] the Vatican text, contrary to the original, the codices and editions 1 and 8,

addunt: *quia semper habuit sapientiam, semper habuit Filium*, quae verba, quia non levi carent interpolationis suspicione, in textum non recepimus.

[4] Libr. I. de Fide ad Gratian. c. 10. n. 64. et 65. — In principio huius loci sola Vat. *habet* pro *habeat*. Mox in codd. B C D E et ed. 1 deest *quando vel*, quod tamen est in originali.

[5] Philip. 4, 7. Verba, quae infra sequuntur: *ori manum admove* et *scrutari non licet*, respiciunt Eccli. 5, 14. et 3, 22.

[6] Cap. 53, 8.

[7] Cap. 3. [Tr. — In ed. critic. sequens *?* ponitur perperam post » quam ante.]

[8] Vat. cum paucis edd. *dicit*.

[9] Libr. XXIX. Moral. c. 1. in principio. Etiam verba, quae sequuntur post *resonamus*, ibidem inveniuntur. In principio primi loci codd. A B D E et edd. 1, 8 omittunt *Iesus*.

[10] Matth. 5, 48. — Paulo ante Vat. ed ed.. 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 *resonemus* pro *resonamus* .

[11] Expos. in Psalm. 2. v. 6. — Paulo ante VAt. perperam *Psalmista*. Eadem Vat. et ed. 4 omittunt *etiam* ante *intelligi*.

[12] Codd. A C E ad marginem et edd. 1, 5, 9 in textu haec addiciunt: *Unde etiam Augustinus in libro LXXXIII quaest. de semper nato* (q. 37.) *disserens ait: melior est natus, quam qui semper nascitur, quia qui semper nascitur nondum natus et nunquam natus est aut natus erit, si semper nascitur. Aliud est enim nasci, aliud natum esse, ac per hoc nunquam Filius est, si nunquam natus est; Filius autem est, quia natus, et semper Filius, quia aeternus, semper ergo natus*. {Tr. — In locum ipsum ed. crit. legit finalis *et* sine italicitione].

[13] Vat. contra codd. et edd. 1, 8 omittit *enim*.

[14] Homil. 2. in Epist. ad Hebr. n. 3.

adds *and* [et].

[3] Codices C E and A (in the margin) together with editions 1 and 8 add: *because He always had wisdom, He always had the Son*, which words, because they carry not a light suspicious of being an interpolation, we have not received into the text.

[4] On the Faith to Gratian, Bk. I, ch. 10, nn. 64 and 65. — In the beginning of this passage the Vatican text alone reads *has* [habet] in the indicative. Then in codices B C D E and edition 1 there is lacking *when and/or* [quando vel], which however is in the original.

[5] Philippians 4:7. The words, which follow below this: *put your hand upon your mouth* and *it is not licit to scrutinize*, refer to Eccli. 5:14 and 3:22. [Tr. Note: here the Latin for *sense* [sensum] means both *sense* and the act of *sensing* and *being sensed*].

[6] Chapter 53:8.

[7] Chapter 2. [Tr. Note: In the critical edition the following *?* is placed, wrongly, after the » rather than before it.]

[8] The Vatican text with a few editions reads *does not say* [non dicit].

[9] Morals, Bk. 29, ch. 1 at the beginning. The word, which follow after *we echo the highest (things) of God* [excelsa Dei resonamus], are also found in the same place. In the beginning of the first passage codices A B D E and editions 1 and 8 omit *Jesus* [Iesus]. [Tr. Note: toward the end of this passage, the equivocity in the Latin *perfectum*, which means both *perfect* and *perfected*, does not exist in English, where the adjective *perfect* and the past participle, *perfected* are distinct.]

[10] Mt. 5:48. — A little before this the Vatican text and editions 3, 4, 7 and 9 reads *let us echo* [resonemus] for *we echo* [resonamus]. [Tr. Note: the equivocation here of *perfecti* and *perfectus* is paralleled in the Greek by □□□□□□□ and □□□□□□□. Although English translations are divided on this, and though it is more metaphysically correct to distinguish *the perfected* from *the perfect* in this passage, in which Christ calls not only for perfection in action, and this by means of an initial, whole, and perfect faith, but also in being, which can be attained only by sanctifying grace; nevertheless the equivocity is itself part of the inspired text, and thus ought to be retained in translation. And this appears very suitable, since it is by means of sanctifying grace that the Christian is perfected; and since this grace is itself a supernatural, created participation in the uncreated, Essence of God, who is the One and the Perfect, there is a consimilarity and unity of these two orders of perfection, which is manifested by this use of equivocal terms.]

[11] Exposition on Psalm 2:6. — A little before this the Vatican text wrongly reads *Psalmist* [Psalmista]. The same Vatican text and edition 4 omitt *also* [etiam] before *be understood* [intelligi].

[12] Codices A C and E at the margin and editions 1, 5, and 9 in the text insert these words: *Whence even (St.) Augustine in the book The 53 Questions speaking in an orderly manner [disserens] of the always born* (q. 37) *says: it is better (to say) "born", than " He who is always being born [nascitur], because He is is always being born is not yet born*

and never has been born or will be born [natus erit], if He is always being born. For it is one (thing) to be born, another to have been born, and through this (line of reasoning) the Son never is, if He never has been born; but the Son is, because He is born, and He always is the Son, because He is eternal, therefore always born." [Tr. Note: we shall see in the following paragraphs this equivocity of *nascitur*: "is born" and "is being born", since Latin lacks the present progressive.

[13] The Vatican text, contrary to the codices and editions 1 and 8, omits *For* [enim].

[14] On the Epistle to the Hebrews, Homily 2, n. 3.

---

p. 178

Origenes vero super Ieremiam[1] dicit, quod Filius semper generatur a Patre, his verbis: « Salvator noster est sapientia Dei; sapientia vero splendor est aeternae lucis: Salvator ergo noster est splendor claritatis. Splendor autem non semel nascitur et desinit, sed quoties ortum fuerit lumen, ex quo splendor oritur, toties oritur etiam splendor claritatis: sic ergo Salvator semper nascitur. Unde ait in libro Sapientis:[2] *Ante omnes colles generat me Dominus*, non, ut quidam male legunt, *generavit* ». His verbis aperte ostendit Origines sane dici posse et debere: *Filius semper nascitur*, quod videtur contrarium illi verbo Gregorii praemisso, scilicet, « non possumus dicere: *semper nascitur* ».

On the other hand [vero], Origin On Jerimiah[1] says, that the Son is always generated from [a] the Father, with these words: « Our Savior is the Wisdom of God; however the Wisdom is the Splendor of the eternal Light: therefore Our Savior is the Splendor of the Clarity. Moreover splendor is not born once and stops [desinit], but as many times a light has risen, from which splendor rises, so often does the splendor of its clarity rise: in the same manner, therefore, the Savior is always born. Whence it says in the book of the Wise Man[2] *Before all the hills the Lord generates me*, not, as certain ones badly read it, *generated* ». With these words Origin openly shows that sanely it can and ought be said: *The Son is always born* [nascitur], which seems contrary to that aforesaid word of (St.) Gregory, namely, « we cannot say: *He is always born* ».

Sed ne tanti auctores sibi contradicere in re tanta videantur, illa[3] verba Gregorii benigne interpetemur. « Dominus, inquit, Iesus ante tempora de Patre natus est, vel potius, quia nec coepit nasci nec desiit, dicamus verius: *semper natus* ». Sed quomodo verius dicitur hoc, scilicet quod Filius sempre natus est, quam illud, scilicet quod de Patre ante tempora natus est? Illud enim sincera et catholica fides tenet ac praedicat ut istud. Quare ergo ait: « Dicamus verius », cum utrumque pariter sit verum, nisi[4] quia volebat intelligi, hoc ad maiorem evidentiam et expressionem veritatis dici quam illud? His etenim verbis omnis

But lest such great authors seem to contradict themselves in such a great matter [re], let us interpret those[3] words of (St.) Gregory in a benign manner [benige]. « The Lord Jesus », he says, « has been born before (all) times of the Father, and/or or rather [potius], because He neither undertook to be born nor failed (to be), let us say more truly: *always born* ». But in what manner can there be more truly said this, namely that the Son has been always born, than that, namely that of the Father before (all) times He has been born? For that does the sincere and catholic Faith hold and preach as its own [istud]. For what

calumniandi versutis haereticis obstruitur aditus, quibus Christi secundum deitatem generatio sine initio et sine fine esse ac perfecta monstratur. Non autem adeo aperte[5] manifestatur veritas, cum dicitur: Filius ante tempora genitus est de Patre, vel Filius semper nascitur de Patre. Et ideo dicit Gregorius, quod « non possumus dicere, semper nascitur »; non, inquam, ita convenienter, non ita congrue ad explanationem veritatis; potest tamen dici, si sane intelligatur. « Semper enim nascitur Filius de Patre », ut ait Origenes; non quod quotidie iteretur illa generatio, sed quia semper est. Semper ergo nascitur, id est, nativitas eius sempiterna est.

reason [quare], therefore, does he say: « Let us say more truly », since each be equally [pariter] true, except[4] that he wanted it to be understood, that this is aid for a greater evidence and expression of the truth than that (other saying)? For indeed by these words every access to the heretic, wilily (enough) to calumniate it, is obstructed, by which the generation of Christ according to (His) Deity is shown to be without a start and without an end, and perfect. Moreover, the truth is not manifested so [adeo] openly[5], when there is said: The Son before (all) times has been begotten of the Father, and/or the Son is always born of the Father. And for that reason (St.) Gregory says, that « we cannot say, He is always born »; not, I say, in so fitting a manner [ita convenienter], not in so congruous a manner for the explanation of the truth; however it can be said, if it is understood in a sane manner. « For the Son is always born of the Father », as Origin says; not that every day that generation is iterated, but that it always is. Therefore He is always born, that is, His nativity is sempiternal.

Hilarius quoque dicit, Filium nasci ex Patre, in libro septimo de Trinitate[6] his verbis: « Vivens Deus et naturae aeeternae viventis potestas est; et quod cum sacramento scientiae suae ex eo nascitur, non potuit aliud esse quam vivens. Nam cum ait: *Sicut misit me vivens Pater, et ego vivo propter Patrem*, docuit, vitam in se per viventem Patrem inesse ». Ecce hic habes, quia[7] Filius nascitur ex Patre. Item in eodem:[8] « Cum dicit Christus: *Sicut Pater habet vitam in se, sic et Filio dedit vitam habere in semetipso*, omnia viva sua ex vivente testatus est. Quod autem ex vivo vivum natum est habet nativitatis perfectum sine novitate naturae. Non enim novum est quod ex vivo generatur in vivum, quia nec ex nihilo est; et vita, quae nativitatem sumit ex vita, necesse est per naturae unitatem et perfectae nativitatis sacramentum, ut et[9] in vivente vivat et in se habeat vitam viventem ». Ecce et hic habes, quia generatur ex vivo vivens Filius. Item in eodem:[10] « In Deo totum quod est vivit; Deus enim vita est, et ex vita non potest

(St.) Hilary also says, that the Son is born out of [ex] the Father, in the seventh book On the Trinity[6] with these words: « The living God is also the Power of an eternal living Nature; and because He is born of Him with the sacrament of His Knowledge [cum sacramento scientiae suae], He could not be other than living. For when He says: *Just as the living Father sent Me, and I live on account of the Father*, He taught, that Life was in Himself [in se inesse] through the living Father ». Behold here you have, that[7] the Son is born out of the Father. Likewise in the same (passage):[8] « When Christ says: *Just as the Father has life in Himself, in the same manner too He gives to the Son to have life in His very self* [semetipso], He has testified that all things living in Himself are out of One living [omnia viva sua ex vivente]. Moreover, because a living thing [vivum] has been born out of a living thing; it has (something) perfect belonging to its nativity without a newness of nature. For (something) is not new, which is generated out of (something) alive into

quidquam esse nisi vivum; neque ex derivatione, sed ex virtute nativitas est. Ac sic, dum totum quod est vivit, et dum totum quod ex eo nascitur virtus est, habet nativitatem Filius, non demutationem ». Et hic dicit, quia nascitur. Item in nono libro de Trinitate:[11] « Donat Pater Filio tantum esse, quantum est ipse, cui innascibilitatis esse imaginem sacramento nativitatis impertit, quem ex se in forma sua generat ». Hic dicit, quia generat Pater Filium.

(something) alive, because neither is it out of nothing; and a life, which takes a nativity out of life, is necessary through a unity of nature and a sacrament of a perfect nativity, so that it too[9] lives in One living and has in Itself a living Life ». Behold here you also have, that the living Son is generated out of One alive [vivo]. Likewise in the same(chapter):[10] « In God the whole which is lives; for God is Life, and out of Life no thing [non quidquam] can be except (something) alive; and the Nativity is not out of a derivation, but out of virtue. And in this manner, while the whole which is lives, and while the whole which is born out of Him is Virtue, the Son has a nativity, not a de-mutation ». And here he says, that He is born. Likewise in the ninth book On the Trinity:[11] « The Father grants to the Son to be as much as [tantum quantum] He Himself is, to Whom He imparts [impertit] by the sacrament of a nativity to be the Image of (His own) innascibility, Whom He generates in His own form ». Here he says, that the Father generates the son.

Dicamus ergo, Filium natum de Patre ante tempora et semper nasci de Patre, sed congruentius semper natum; et eundem fateamur ab aeterno esse et Patri coaeternum, id est auctori. Pater enim generatione auctor Filii est, ut in sequenti[12] ostendetur. Ut ergo Pater est aeternus, ita et Filius aeternus est, sed Pater sine auctore, Filius vero non, quia Pater innascibilis, Filius natus. Et ut ait Hilarius in duodecimo libro de Trinitate:[13] « Aliud est sine auctore semper esse aeternum, aliud Patri, id est auctori, esse coaeternum. Ubi autem Pater auctor est, ibi et nativitas est; quia sicut nativitas ab auctore est, ita et ab aeterno auctore aeterna nativitas est. Omne autem, quod semper est, etiam aeternum est; sed tamen non omne, quod aeternum est etiam innatum est; quia quod ab aeterno nascitur habet aeternum esse, quod natum est. Quod autem non natum est, id cum aeternitate non natum est; quod vero ex aeterno natum est, id, si non aeternum natum est, iam non erit et Pater auctor aeternus. Si quid ergo ei, qui ab aeterno Patre natus est, ex aeternitate defuerit, id ipsum auctori non est ambiguum defuisse,

Le us say, therefore, that the Son (has) been born of the Father before (all) times and that He is always born of the Father, but more congruently that He always (has) been born; let us say [fateamur] that the Same is both from eternity [ab aeterno] and is coeternal to the Father, that is to (His) author. For the Father by generation is the author of the Son, as will be shown in the following (distinction).[12] Therefore, as the Father is eternal, so also the Son is eternal, but the Father without an author, the Son, on the other hand, non (so), because the Father (is) innascible, the Son born. And as (St.) Hilary says in the twelfth book On the Trinity:[13] « It is one thing [aliud] to be eternal always without an author, another thing [aliud] to be coeternal to the Father, that is to an author. Moreover where the Father is author, there also is a nativity; because just as a nativity is from [ab] an author, so also from an eternal author there is an eternal nativity. Moreover everything [omne], which always is, is also eternal; but, however, not everything, which is eternal, is also unborn [innatum]; because what is born from eternity [ab aeterno] has an

quia

eternal " to be ", which has been born. Moreover because it has not been born, on that account [id] it has not been born with eternity [cum aeternitate]; on the other hand [vero] because it has been born out of an eternal [ex aeterno], on that account, if there is not an eternal born, then [iam] there is not even an eternal father-author. Therefore, if anything (pertaining) to Him, who has been born by the eternal Father, failed [defuerit] out of eternity [ex aeternitate], on that account there is no ambiguity that He failed his author [auctori], because

---

[1] Homil. 6. in c. 11. circa finem, sed non paucis mutatis.
[2] Prov. 8, 25 secundum Septuag.; Vulgata: *ante colles ego parturiebar*. — Aliquae edd. sic citant: *in libro Sapientiae* pro *Sapientis*, cui errori etiam codd. favent; ed. 9 *unde ait in Prov. 8 Sapientia*.
[3] Sola Vat. omittit *illa*.
[4] Mss. B C E addunt *forte*.
[5] Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 9 superflue addunt *semper*; codd. B C omisso *aperte* legunt *semper*. Immediate post cod. D et edd. 1, 8 *monstratur* pro *manifestatur*.
[6] Num. 27. — Textus Scripturae, ab Hilario citatus, est Ioan. 6, 58, ubi Hilarius ponit *per Patrem* loco *propter Patrem*, quod habet Vulgata.
[7] Codd. *quod* loco *quia*. Postea cod. D et edd. 1, 8 *de Patre* loco *ex Patre*.
[8] Ibid. — Textus Scripturae est Ioan. 5, 26, ubi Vulgata et edd. 1, 2, 5, 9 *semetipso* pro *se*. Deinde post *ex vivente* cod. D addit glossema *Patre*, et cod. A *omnino vitam suam* pro *omnia viva sua*.
[9] Edd. 1, 8 omittunt *et*, quod ceterae auctoritates nostrae cum Hilario habent; mox eadem particula *et* post *Ecce* omittitur a cod. D et ed. 8.
[10] Loc. cit. n. 28. — Codd. C D E addunt *Hilarius*, et C E prosequuntur: *Attende quod totum* pro *In Deo totum*. Deinde edd. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 contra originale et male legunt *ex virtute nativitatis* pro *ex virtute nativitas*. Immediate post Vat. cum pluribus edd. mendose legit *si* pro *sic*, quod habetur in originali et edd. 5, 6, 8, 9.
[11] Num 54, ubi contra codd., edd. 5, 9 et originale ceterae edd. habent *impartit* pro *impertit*. Deinde ed. Maurin. Hilarii legit *in formam suam* pro *in forma sua*.
[12] Immediate post, et Dist. XV. circa finem.
[13] Num. 21. — In hoc textu cira medium pro *ex aeterno* edd. 1, 8 non bene *ab aeterno*, et paulo post codd. D E *qui Pater* pro *et Pater*.

[1] Homily 6, in ch. 11, near the end, but with not a few changes.
[2] Prov. 8:25 according the Septuagint; the Vulgate reads: *before the hills I desire to be brought forth* [parturiebar]. — Some editions cite it thus: *in the book of Wisdom* for *of the Wise Man*, which error even the codices favor; edition 9 reads *whence in Prov. 8 Wisdom says*.
[3] The Vatican text alone omits *that* [illa].
[4] Manuscripts B C and E add *perchance* [forte].
[5] The Vatican text and editions 4, 5, 6 and 9 superfluously add *always* [semper]. Immediately before this codex D and editions 1 and 8 read *is shown* [monstratur] for *is manifested* [manifestatur].
[6] N. 27. — The text of Scripture, cited by (St.) Hilary, is John 6:58, in which (St.) Hilary puts *through the Father* [per Patrem] in place of *on account of the Father* [propter Patrem], as the Vulgate has it. [Tr. Note: just before the scriptural citation, the Latin can be rendered in two manners, as St. Bonaventure does here in dubium VIII, as the translation has it above, or with *sacramento* rendered as an ablative of means or specification, *when (by or according to) the sacrament of His Knowledge He is born of Him*, following St. Hilary's similar use at the end of this paragraph.]
[7] The codices read *that* [quod] in place of *that* [quia]. After this codex B and editions 1 and 8 read *of the Father* [de Patre] in place of *out of the Father* [ex Patre].
[8] Ibid. — The text of Scripture is John 5:26, in which the Vulgate and editions 1, 2, 5 and 9 read *in His very self* [semetipso] for *in Himself* [in se]. Then after the next*out of* [ex] codex D reads by glossing *the living Father* [vivente Patre], and codex A has *entirely His own life* [omnino vitam suam] for *all things living in Himself* [omnia viva sua].
[9] Editions 1 and 8 omit *too* [et], which our other authorities have with (St.O HIlary; then *also* [et] after *Behold* [Ecce] is omitted by codex D and edition 8.
[10] Loc. cit., n. 28. — Codices C D and E add *(St.) Hilary (says)* [Hilarius], and C and E proceed: *Attend that the whole* [Attende quod totum] for *In God the whole* [In Deo totum]. Then editions 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9, contrary to the original and badly, read *it is . . . ut*

of the virtue of the nativity [ex virtute nativitatis] for *the nativity . . . out of virtue* [ex virtute nativitas]. Immediately after this the Vatican text, together with very many editions, reads faultily *if* for *in the same manner* [sic], which is had in the original and in editions 5, 6, 8, and 9.
[11] N. 54, where contrary to the codices, editions 5 and 9 and the original of the rest of the editions have *imparts* [impartit] for *imparts* [impertit]. Then the Maruin. edition of (St.) Hilary reads *unto His own form* [in formam suam] for *in His own form* [in forma sua].
[12] Immediately after this one, and in Distinction 15, near the end.
[13] N. 21. — In this text near the middle in place of *out of an eternal* [ex aeterno] editions 1 and 8 have not so well *from from eternity* [ab aeterno], and a little after this codices D and E have *one who (is) an* [qui] for *even an* [et]. [Tr. Note: Here the Latin *aeternum* is being used equivocally: it is customarily used for *eternity* [aeternitas] in the phrases *in eternity* [in aeternum] and *from eternity* [ab aeterno] in the sense of *the eternal age* [aeternum saeculum]; but it can also be used as a substantive *an eternal thing* [aeternum]. The translation follows the customary usage.]

---

si gignenti est infinitum gignere, et nascenti etiam est infinitum nasci. Medium enim quid inter nativitatem Dei Filii et generationem Dei Patris nec ratio[1] nec sensus admittit, quia et in generatione nativitas est, et in nativitate generatio est, quia sine utroque neutrum est: utrumque ergo sine intervallo sui est ».

if to the one begetting [gignenti] there is an infinite begetting [gignere], there is also to the one being born [nascenti] even an infinite being born [nasci]. For the medium which (is) between the nativity of the Son of God and the generation of God the Father admits neither *reckoning*[1] nor sensing, because both the nativity is in the generation, and the generation is in the nativity, because without each neither is: therefore each [utrumque] is without an interval to the other [sui] ».

Cap. V.

De obiectionibus haereticorum nitentium probare, Filium non esse coaeternum Patri.

Chapter V

On the objections of the heretics striving to prove, that the Son is not coeternal to the Father.

« Sed inquiet haereticus: omne quod natum est non fuit semper, quia in id natum est, ut esset. Nemo ambigit, quin ea[2] quae in rebus humanis nata sunt, aliquando non fuerint. Sed aliud est ex eo nasci, quod semper non fuit, aliud ex eo natum esse, quod semper

« But the heretic will say: everything [omne] which has been born was not always, because it was born unto something [in id], that it might be. Do one is doubtful [ambigit], that those things [ea][2] which have been born in human affairs [rebus],

est. Ibi nec semper fuit, qui pater est, nec semper pater est; et qui non semper pater est, non semper genuit. Ubi autem semper pater est, semper filius est. Quod si semper Deo Patri proprium est, quod semper est Pater, necesse est, semper Filio proprium esse, quod semper est Filius. Quomodo ergo cadet in intelligentiam nostram, ut non fuerit semper cui proprium est, semper esse quod natum est?[3] Natum ergo unigenitum Deum confitemur, sed natum ante tempora, nec ante esse quam natum, nec ante natum quam esse; quia nasci quod erat, iam non nasci est, sed se ipsum demutare nascendo. Hoc autem humanum sensum et intelligentiam mundi excedit. Non hoc capit ratio humanae intelligentiae, sed prudentiae fidelis professio est ».[4]

were not at some time. But it is one thing [aliud] to be born out of that, which was not always, another thing [aliud] to have been born out of that, which is always. In this [ibi] there was not always, one who is father, nor is he a father always; and who is not always a father, has not always begotten. Moreover where there is always a father, there is always a son. Because if it is always proper to God the Father, that He is always the Father, it is necessary, that it is always proper to the Son, that He is always the Son. In what manner, therefore, does it fall unto our understanding, that there was not always the One to Whom it is proper, to be always that which has been born?[3] Therefore we confess that the Only-Begotten God (has) been born, but born before (all) times, neither being [esse] before [ante quam] being born, nor having been born before being; because for that which is to be born, is already not to be born, but to de-mutate one's very self by being born. Moreover this exceeds human sense [sensus] and understanding. This the reckoning of human understanding does not grasp, but is it the profession of the foresight of faith [prudentiae fidelis] ».[4]

---

[1] Codd. et plurimae edd. contra originale et Vat. omittunt *nec ratio*; et deinde ante *in generatione* Vat. cum paucis edd. omittit *et*.
[2] In codd. et Hilario deest *ea*. — Paulo post, ante *ex eo natum* Vat. cum paucis edd. *est*.
[3] Apud Hilar. (ed. Maurin.) *natus est*, ubi in calce dicitur, plures codd. lectionem *natum* exhibere, quam mss. nostri et edd. habent. — Mox codd. C D E post *iam non* addunt *tantum*. [Tr. — In ed. criticali hac nota portat perperam numerum *4* in loco *3*.]
[4] Totum hoc cap. excerptum est ex Hilario loc. cit. n. 22-26, sed plurimis omissis.

[1] The codices and very many of the editions, contrary to the original and Vatican texts, omits *neither a reckoning* [nec ratio]; and then before *in the generation* [in generatione] the Vatican text with a few of the editions omtis *both* [et].
[2] In the codices and (St.) Hilary there is lacking *those things* [ea]. — A little after this, before *another thing* [aliud] the Vatican text and a few other editions read *it is* [aliud est].
[3] In the text of (St.) Hilary, Marin. edition, there is *because He has been born* [quod natus est], where it is said in the footnotes, that very many codices exhibit the reading *that which has been born* [quod natum est], which our manuscripts and editions have. — Then codices C D and E after *already not* [iam non] add *only* [tantum]. [Tr. Note: In the critical edition, this footnote is wrongly numbered as *4* instead of *3*
[4] The whole of this chapter has been excerpted from (St.) Hilary loc. cit., nn. 22-26, but with very many things omitted.

English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM IX.

De proprietatibus, quae respiciunt personas, et quidem de emanatione generationis.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 179-182.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION IX

On the properties, which respect the Persons, and indeed on the emanation of generation.

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 179-182.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Nunc ad distinctionem personarum accedamus etc.

Now let us proceed to the distinction of the Persons etc.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Supra egit Magister de proprietatibus, quae respiciunt essentiam. Hic agit de his, quae respiciunt personas; et haec pars habet duas partes. Quia enim distinctio personarum attenditur secundum duplicem emanationem, scilicet generationis et processionis, ideo *primo* agit de generatione, *secundo* vero de processione, infra distinctione decima: *Nunc vero post Filii aternitatem de Spiritu sancto* etc.

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

Above Master (Peter) dealt with the properties, which respect the Essence. Here he deals with those, which respect the Persons; and this part has two parts. For, because the distinction of Persons is tended to according to a twofold emanation, that is, of generation and of procession, for that reason he *first* dealt with generation, but second with procession, below in the tenth distinction: *But now after the eternity of the*

Son, let us discuss in an orderly manner the Holy Spirit etc..

Item, prima pars habet duas partes: in *prima* ostendit, quid de generatione Filii est sentiendum, *secundo* ex incidenti, quo sermone est ipsa exprimenda, ibi: *Hic quaeri potest, cum generatio Filii a Patre* etc.

Likewise the first part has two parts: in the *first* he shows, what must be thought [sentiendum] of the generation of the Son, *second* from a question that crops up [ex incidenti], in what (manner of) speech is it to be expressed, there (where he says): *Here it can be asked, since the generation of the Son by the Father* etc..

Prima iterum pars habet quatuor partes.[1] Primo proponit veritatem, quae est a catholicis retinenda, scilicet quod generans et genitus sunt per generationem distincti et coaeterni, ita quod generatio est distinctiva et aeterna. In secunda contra hoc opponit per oppositionem haereticorum, ibi: *Sed contra hoc inquit haereticus*. In tertia determinat, contra arguendo per rationes catholicorum Doctorum Augustini et Ambrosii, ibi: *Qui hoc dicit non intelligit, etiam natum esse* etc. In quarta et ultima respondet, compescendo inquisitionem superfluam haereticorum et etiam catholicorum superborum, ibi: *Sed quaeris a me, inquit Ambrosius*, ubi ostendit quod imperscrutabile[2] est sacramentum generationis.

The First part, again, has four parts.[1] First he proposes the truth, which is to be retained by Catholics, that is, that the One generating and the One begotten are through generation distinct and coeternal, so that the generation is distinctive and eternal. In the second, against this, he opposes through the opposition of heretics, there (where he says): *But against this the heretic says*. In the third he determines, by arguing against (them) through the reasons of the catholic Doctors, (Sts.) Augustine and Ambrose, there (where he says): *Who says this does not understand, even that to have been born* etc.. In the fourth and last he responds, by restraining the inquiry [compescendo inquisitionem] of heretics and even of proud Catholics, there (where he says): *But you seek from me, says (St.) Ambrose* , where he shows that the sacrament of the generation is incapable of being thoroughly scrutinized [imperscrutablie].[2]

Hic quaeri potest, cum generatio Filii a Patre etc. Haec est *secunda* pars huius disctinctionis, in qua Magister determinat, quo sermone generationis aeternitas congruentius exprimatur; et haec pars habet quatuor partes. In prima ponit doctorum apparentem controversiam. Nam quidam dicunt, eam debere exprimi per verba[3] praeteriti temporis, alii, per verba praesentis. In secunda praedictam controverisam reducit ad concordantiam, ibi: *Sed ne tanti auctores in re tanta sibi contradicere videantur*. In tertia per verba Hilarii confirmat responsionem suam, ne videatur dictis Origenis inniti, ibi: *Hilarius quoque dicit, Filium nasci ex Patre* etc. In quarta concludit summatim, quid dicendum

Here it can be asked, since the generation of the Son by the Father etc.. This is the *second* part of this distinction, in which Master (Peter) determines, in what (manner of) speech the eternity of the generation is more congruently expressed; and this part has four parts. In the first he posits the apparent controversy of the Doctors. For indeed they say, that it ought to be expressed through verbs[3] of the past tense, others, through verbs of the present (tense). In the second he reduces the aforesaid controversy to harmony [concordantiam], there (where he says): *But lest such great authors seem to contradict themselves in such a great matter*. In the third he confirms through the words of (St.) Hilary his own

sit[4] sive quomodo loquendum et quomodo etiam de generatione ateterna sentiendum, ibi: *Dicamus ergo Filium natum de Patre*, ubi confirmat veritatem per auctoritatem Hilarii, per quam etiam solvit obiectionem haeretici.

answer [responsionem], lest it seem that it is supported by the sayings of Origen, there (where he says): *(St.) Hilary also says, that the Son is born out of the Father* etc.. In the fourth he concludes by summarizing [summatim], what must be[4] said of the eternal generation or in what manner it must be spoken of and in what manner also it must be considered, there (where he says): *Let us say, therefore, that the Son has been Born of the Father*, where he confirms the truth through the authority of (St.) Hilary, through which he also solves the objection of (Arius,) the heretic.

---

[1] Ed. 1 *particulas*.
[2] Postulantibus mss. et ed. 1, substituimus *imperscrutabile* loco *inscrutabile*. Mox Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1, verbis Magistri *Hic quaeri potest* etc. omissis, pro *Haec est* ponit *Similiter*, deinde propter constructionem mutatam omittit *et haec pars*.
[3] Unus alterve cod. ut 1 cum ed. 1 hic *verbum*, sed paulo post plurimi codd. sibi non constantes *verbum praesentis*.
[4] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 hic adiecimus *sit*, quod Vat. ponit infra post *sentiendum*.

[1] Edition 1 has *smaller parts* [particulas]. [Tr. Note: In the words of Master Peter which preface this Division before *Persons*[personarum] the word *Three* [trium] is omitted.]
[2] Having compared the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *incapable of being thoroughly scrutinized* [imperscrutabile] in place of *inscrutable*. Then the Vatican text, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, having omitted the words of Master (Peter), *Here it can be asked* etc., puts *Similarly* [Similiter] in place of *This is* [Haec est], then on account of a changed construction it omits *and this part* [et haec pars]. [Tr. Note: here *sacrament of the generation* has the sense of *mystery of the generation*, following the patristic usage of *sacramentum*.]
[3] One or the other codex, such as 1, together with edition 1, has *verb* [verbum] here, but a little after this very many codices, inconsistent with themselves, have *a verb of the present (tense)* [verbum praesentis].
[4] On the faith of very many manuscripts and edition 1 here have here inserted *be* [sit], which the Vatican text puts below this at *considered* [sentiendum].

---

p. 180

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad intelligentiam eorum quae dicit Magister de generatione aeterna, in praesenti distinctione quatuor principaliter quaeruntur.

Primo quaritur, utrum in divinis sit ponenda generatio.
Secundo, dato quod sic, utrum generatio in divinis sit[1] personarum distinctiva.
Tertio quaeritur, utrum illa

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For an understanding of those (things) which Master (Peter) says of the eternal generation, in the present distinction four (questions are principally asked:

First there is asked, whether generation is to be posited among the divine [in divinis].
Second, given that it is, whether generation among the divine is[1] distinctive of the Persons.

generatio sit aeterna.
Quarto et ultimo quaeritur, utrum illa generatio sit terminata.

Third there is asked, whether that generation is eternal.
Fourth and last there is asked, whether that generation has been terminated.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

ARTICLE SOLE

De generatione in divinis.

On generation among the divine.

Quaestio I.

Question 1

Utrum in divinis generatio ponenda sit.

Whether generation is to be posited among the divine.

C**IRCA PRIMUM**, quod generatio sit in divinis, ostenditur:[2]

A**BOUT THE FIRST**, that generation be among the divine, is shown:[2]

1. Primo *a minori*. Multo fortius debet esse generatio in eo qui generationem aliis tribuit, quam in his quae recipiunt; sed generatio est in creaturis: ergo et in Deo qui tribuit. Et hoc est quod dicitur Isaiae ultimo:[3] *Si ego generationem aliis tribuo, sterilis ero? dicit Dominus*, quasi dicat, non.

1. First *by the minor*. Much more strongly ought there be generation in Him who grants generation to others, than in those which receive it; but generation is in creatures: therefore also in God who grants it. And this is what is said in the last (chapter) of Isaiah:[3] *If I grant generation to others, shall I be sterile? says the Lord*, as if to say, " No ".

2. Item, ostenditur illud idem *a posteriori*. Per prius enim est paternitas in Deo quam in creatura; sed paternitas et generatio vere est in creatura: ergo et in Deo. Quod prius sit ibi, dicit Apostolus ad Ephesios tertio:[4] *Ex quo omnis paternitas in caelo et in terra nominatur*.

2. Likewise, that same is shown *a posteriori*. For through a (consideration of what is) prior, paternity is in God rather than in a creature; but paternity and generation are truly in a creature: therefore also in God. That it is prior There, the Apostle says in the third (chapter of the Letter) to the Ephesians:[4] *Out of Whom every paternity in heaven and earth are named.*

3. Item, ostenditur hoc ipsum *a simili*, quia omne quod perfectionis est, attribuendum est Deo, in quo est summa omnis perfectionis; sed generatio est perfectionis in creatura, ut vult Philosophus,[5] quia « perfectum est quod potest generare quale ipsum est »: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, this very same is shown *from what is similar* [a simili], because everything [omne] which belongs to perfection, must be attributed to God, in whom there is the sum [summa] of all perfection; but generation belongs to perfection in a creature, as the Philosopher would have it [vult],[5] because « perfect is that which can generate that which it is »: ergo etc..

4. Item, illud idem ostenditur *alia ratione* sic:[6] divina natura est summe bona et actualissima: ergo summe potest et vult se communicare; sed prima et summa ratio

4. Likewise, that same is shown *by another reckoning* thus:[6] the Divine Nature is most highly good and most actual: therefore most highly is it able and does It will to

communicandi est in generatione: ergo necesse est in divinis ponere generationem.

communicate Itself; but the first and most high reckoning of communicating is in generation: therefore it is necessary to posit generation among the divine.

Contra: 1. Generatio in creaturis aut est *perfectionis*, aut *imperfectionis*. Si *perfectionis*, tunc ergo, cum substantiae spiritualies et incorporales sint nobilissimae, debet in eis generatio esse: ergo cum non sit in eis, non est nobilitatis; sed quod non est nobilitatis non est in Deo: ergo etc.

On the contrary: 1. Generation in creatures either belongs to *perfection*, or to *imperfection*. If to *perfection*, then, therefore, since spiritual and incorporeal substances are the most noble, generation ought to be among them: therefore since it is not among them, it does not belong to nobility; but what does not belong to nobility is not in God: ergo etc..

2. Item, ubi est generatio, ibi est variatio; generatio enim est species motus, et inter omnes species motus maior est variatio in motu secundum substantiam, quia est entis in potentia, minor in motu secundum locum:[7] ergo cum in Deo non sit variatio nec aliqua species motus, etiam illa quae minima est, ut loci mutatio: ergo nec generatio.

2. Likewise, where there is generation, there is variation; for generation is a species of movement [motus], and among all the species of movement greater is the variation in movement according to substance, because it belongs to a being in potency, less in motion according to place:[7] therefore since in God there is not a variation nor any species of movement, (so) also that which is the least, as a mutation of place: ergo neither generation.

3. Item, ubi est generatio, ibi est corruptio, unde Philosophus[8] dicit, quod « propter longe stare a principio reliquo modo complevit esse Deus, continuam in his faciens generationem »; et huiusmodi signum est, quod sola corruptibilia generant et generantur in creaturis; sed in Deo nulla cadit corruptio: ergo nec generatio.

3. Likewise, where there is generation, there is corruption, whence the Philosopher[8] says, that « on account of their being [stare] far from their Principle, God completed their "being" [esse] in the last manner [reliquo modo], making generation continuous among them »; and the sign of this manner is, that only corruptibles generate and are generated in creatures; but in God no corruption occurs [cadit]: ergo neither generation.

4. Item, ubi est generatio, ibi est[9] nutritio; unde ad tot et plures se extendit vis nutritiva quam generativa; sed in Deo non est vis nutritiva: ergo nec generativa, ergo nec nutritio, nec generatio: ergo generatio non est in divinis.

4. Likewise, where there is generation, there is[9] nourishing [nutritio]; whence the nutritive force extends itself to all and more than the generative; but in God there not a nutritive force: therefore neither a generative, therefore neither nourishing, nor generation: therefore generation is not among the divine.

---

[1] Auctoritate plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic additum *ponenda*.
[2] Cod. W addit *sic*.
[3] Vers. 9, ubi Vulgata loco *aliis* ponit *ceteris* et pro *dicit* habet *ait*. [Tr. — Mox ante *posteriori* ed. criticali *a* manca italicatio.]

[1] On the authority of very many manuscripts and edition 1 we have expunged here the added *to be posited* [ponenda].
[2] Codex W adds *thus* [sic].
[3] Verse 9, where the Vulgate in place of *to others* [aliis] puts *to all others* [ceteris] and for *says* [dicit]

[4] Vers. 15, in quo textu Vulgata *caelis* loco *caelo*. — Paulo ante ed. 1 *per prius* pro *prius*.
[5] Libr. II. de Anima, text. 34. (c. 4) et IV. Meteor, text. 19. (c. 3.).
[6] Vat. cum cod. cc omittit *sic*, et pro *alia ratione* ponit *illa ratione*, sed obest auctoritas aliorum mss. et ed. 1.
[7] Vide Aristot., V. Phys. text 7. seqq. et VIII. text 55. seqq. (c. 7).
[8] Libr. II. de Gener. et corrupt. text. 59. secundum transl. arabico-latinum. In ed. vero Paris. c. 10. ita exhibetur: Hoc vero (esse sive existere) in omnibus inesse impossibile sit, propterea quod longe ab ipso principio distent: reliquo modo Deus ipse universum complevit, continua facta generatione. Vide etiam II. de Anima, text 35. (c. 4). — Vat. loco *Philosophus* ponit *Auctor de causis*, sed falso et contra omnes mss., quorum pauci ut H I O indicant etiam locum addendo *in libro de Generat. et corruptione*, et plures *primo* ponunt pro *principio*. Mox nonnulli codd. ut H T ee ff cum ed. 1 *quia* loco *quod*.
[9] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *est*. — Vide Aristot., II. de Anima, text. 42. seqq. (ch.4.).

has *says* [ait]. [Tr. Note: in the critical edition before *posteriori* the *a* lacks italicization].
[4] Verse 15, in which text the Vulgate has *in the heavens* [in caelis] in place of *in heaven* [in caelo]. — A little before this edition 1 reads *through (a consideration of what is) prior* [per prius] for *prior*.
[5] On the Soul, Bk. II, text 34, (ch. 4) and Meteorology, Bk. IV, text 19, (ch. 3).
[6] The Vatican text together with codex cc omits *thus* [sic], and puts *by that reckoning* [illa ratio] for *by another reckoning* [alia ratione], but the authority of the other manuscripts and edition 1 opposes this.
[7] See Aristotle, Physics, Bk. 5, text 7 ff. and Bk. VIII, text 55 ff (ch. 7).
[8] On Generation and Corruption, Bk. II, text 59, according to the Arabic-Latin translation. But in the edition of Paris, ch. 10, it is exhibited thus: But this (to be or to exist) is impossible to be in [inesse] all things, on account of this that they are far distant from the Principle Itself: in the last manner God Himself completed the universe, having made generation continuous. See also On the Soul, Bk. II, text 35, (ch. 4). — The Vatican text in place of *Philosopher* [Philosophus] puts *Author (of the book) On Causes* [Auctor de causis], but falsely and contrary to all the manuscripts, of which a few, such as H I and O, even indicate the passage by adding *in the book On Generation and corruption* [in libro De Generat. et corruptione], and very many put *the first (being)* [primo] for *the Principle* [principio]. Then not a few codices, such as H T ee and ff, together with edition 1, have *that* [quia] for *that* [quod].
[9] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted *is* [est]. — See Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. II, text 42 ff., (ch. 4).

CONCLUSIO.

Generatio ponenda est in divinis, cuius congruitas et modus explicatur.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod generatio ponenda est in divino esse.[1]

Et huius ratio potissima est, ut credo, quia omnis natura est communicabilis; et quia in Deo propter sui nobilitatem est aptitudo actui coniuncta, immo ipse actus, oportet quod natura sit pluribus communicata; sed non possunt esse plures ab una natura, quin unus sit ab alio, vel ambo a tertio: ergo cum ante divinas personas nihil sit, oportet quod

CONCLUSION

Generation is to be posited among the divine, the congruity and manner of which is explained.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that generation is to be posited in the Divine "Being" [in divino esse].[1]

And the strongest [potissima] reason for this is, as I believe, that every nature is communicable; and that in God on account of His own nobility there is an aptitude conjoined to action [actui], nay (there is) Action itself, (wherefore) it is opportune that the Nature has been communicated to many [pluribus]; but there cannot be many

una sit ab alia. Et quoniam sunt conformes in natura, et generatio est emanatio secundum conformitatem naturae: ideo credo, quod necesse est in divinis ponere generationem.

from one Nature, unless [quin] one be from an other, and/or both from a third: therefore, since before the Divine Persons there was nothing, it is proper that One be from an Other. And since They are conform in Nature, and generation is an emanation according to the conformity of nature: for that reason I believe, that it is necessary to posit generation among the divine.

Ut autem intelligatur, per quem modum, notandum, quod *generare* de sui propria ratione est similem sibi in substantia et natura producere.[2] Sibi vero similem contingit produci tripliciter:[3] *aut* per impressionem suae similitudinis in alio; et sic generatur character a sigillo, lumen a luminoso, species ab obiecto; *alio modo* per educationem speciei consimilis ab alio; et sic generatur elementum ab elemento; *tertio modo* per productionem similis de simili sive de se ipso; et sic generatur animatum ab animato; et iste tertius modus est perfectior, unde non reperitur nisi in substantiis habentibus formam nobilem, quae est vita.[4] Et iste modus generationis est secundum nascentiam et est in Deo et[5] creaturis, sed *differenter*; quia producere alium ex se ipso potest esse dupliciter, vel *ex se toto*, vel *ex parte sui*.

Moreover to understand, through which manner, it must be noted, that *to generate* from its own proper reckoning is to produce (something) similar to one's self in substance and nature.[2] However a similar to one's self happens to be produced in a threefold manner:[3] *either* through the impression of its own similitude in an other; and in this manner there is generated a character by a seal [sigillo], a light by the luminous, the species by the object; *in another manner* through drawing out [educationem] of a consimilar species from an other; and in this manner there is generated element from element; *in a third manner* through the production of a similar from [de] a similar or from [de] one's very self; and in this manner there is generated the animate by the animate; and this third manner is more perfect, whence it is not found except in substances having the noble form, which is life.[4] And this manner of generation is according to birth [nascentiam] and is in God and[5] creatures, but *differently*; because to produce an other out of one's very self can be in a twofold manner, *out of one's whole self* [ex se toto], and/or *out of part of oneself* [ex parte sui].

Ex se toto non potest producere nisi ille, cuius essentia potest esse in pluribus una et tota. Nam si non potest esse in pluribus una et tota, si generans dat totam suam substantiam generato, tunc substantia tota transit in generatum,[6] et generans perdit substantiam totam generando, quod esse non potest. Ideo ad hoc necesse est, quod talem habeat substantiam, quae una et tota sit in pluribus. Talis autem substantia non est nisi substantia habens summam simplicitatem; haec autem est sola divina esstentia,[7] in qua propter summam simplicitatem suppositum non addit ad

Out of one's whole self no one [non] can produce except Him, whose essence can be in many One and Whole. For if it cannot be in many one and whole, if the one generating gives his whole substance to the one generated, then the whole substance passes over into the one generated,[6] and the one generating looses [perdit] (his) whole substance by generating, which cannot be. For that reason for this it is necessary, that it have such a substance, which is one and whole in many. Moreover there is no [non est] such substance except the Substance having a most high

essentiam, unde nec ipsam coarctat nec limitat nec formam multiplicat. Et ideo in ea[8] potest esse generatio communicans eandem substantiam totam; et talis generatio est omnimodae perfectionis et in solo Deo reperitur, ratione iam dicta.

simplicity; moreover this is the Divine Essence alone,[7] in which on account of (its) most high simplicity a Supposit does not add to the Essence, whence it neither constricts [coartat] it, nor limits (It), nor multiplies (Its) form. And for that reason in It[8] there can be a generation communicating the same whole Substance; and such a generation belongs to an omnimodal perfection and is found in God alone, for the reason just said.

Alio modo contingit aliquem ex se producere quantum ad *partem sui*. Sic pater naturalis generat filium, partem substantiae transmittendo et decidendo.[9] Et haec generatio necessario est cum *transmutatione*; quia enim pars decisa non habet actum totius, necesse est, quod per mutationem acquirat; sed quod acquirit quod non habet, variatur; ideo haec generatio est mutatio et habet variationem coniunctam. Est etiam cum *corruptione* annexa; quia enim aliqua pars generantis deperditur, generans est, a quo potest fieri ablatio et ita corruptio. Est etiam *conservatione*[10] adiuncta; quia enim fit deperditio, necesse est quod per nutrimentum fiat restauratio. Et ideo generatio in creatura et perfectionis et imperfectionis est: perfectionis a parte virtutis producentis, imperfectionis a parte subiecti divisbilis. Et ideo est in solis animatis, quae habent formam perfectionis, ipsam scilicet[11] animam, et corpus defectibile et restaurabile.

In another manner it happens that someone produces out of himself as much as regards *part of himself*. In this manner a natural father generates a son, by transmitting and by letting fall off [decidendo] part of (his) substance.[9] And this generation is necessarily with a *transmutation*; for because a part fallen off [decisa] does not have the action [actus] of the whole, it is necessary, that it acquire it through a mutation; but because it acquires what it does not have, it is varied; for that reason this generation is a mutation and has a conjoined variation. It is also with an annexed *corruption*; for because some part of the one generating is lost from it [deperditur], there is one generating, from whom an ablation can come to be and thus a corruption. There is also an adjoined *conservation*;[10] for because a loss [disperditio] is wrought, it is neccessary that through nourisment [nutrimentum] there be wrought a restoration. And for that reason generation in a creature belongs both to perfection and to imperfection: to perfection on the part of the virtue of the one producing, to imperfection on the part of the divisible subject. And for that reason it is in animate (creatures) alone, which have the form of perfection, namely[11] the soul itself, and the defectible and restorable body.

Generatio vero in divinis est omnimodae perfectionis. Quia[12] enim non est *ex parte*, ideo est, quod habet *actu speciem*. Et ideo nec ibi est in natura *imperfectio* nec *variatio*, quia nihil novum acquiritur; nec *corruptio*, quia nihil adimitur; nec *nutritio*, quia nihil[13] restituitur.

On the other hand generation among the divine belongs to an omnimodal perfection. For because[12] it is not *out of a part*, it is for this reason, that it has *species in act* [actu speciem]. And for that reason there is in the Nature neither *imperfection* nor *variation*, because nothing new is acquired; nor *corruption*, because nothing is taken away

[adimitur]; nor a *nourishing*, because nothing[13] is re-established [restituitur].

Et ex hoc patet solutio obiectorum; quia *generatio*[14] *de toto* est tantae perfectionis, quod non potest esse in creatura aliqua; *generatio* vero *ex parte* tantam habet imperfectionem coniunctam,[15] ut non possit esse circa substantiam invariabilem et incorruptibilem et simplicem, non solum in natura increata, verum etiam in creata. Alia rationes probant de generatione quae est *ex parte*.

And from this the solution of the objections is clear; because *generation*[14] *from* [de] *the whole* is of so great a perfection, that it cannot be in any creature; but *generation out of a part* has so great a conjoined imperfection,[15] that it cannot be about an invariable and incorruptible and simple substance, not only in the uncreated Nature, but also in one created. The other reasons prove concerning [de] the generation which is *out of a part*.

---

[1] Ex codd. et ed. 1 substituimus *divino esse* pro *divinis*, deinde supplevimus particulam *Et*. Mox post *credo* codd. H I *quia in divinis* et ed. 1 *quia Dei* loco *quia omnis*.
[2] Vide Aristot., II. de Anima, text. 34. (c. 4.); VII. Metaph. text. 22. et 28. (VI. c. 7. et 8.).
[3] Vat. cum cod. cc, antiquioribus autem mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, *in natura producere tripliciter est* loco *contingit produci tripliciter*.
[4] Hinc et generatio sub hoc respectu communiter definitur: origo viventis a vivente ut principio coniuncto in similitudem naturae.
[5] Aliqui codd. ut X Z repetunt hic *in*.
[6] Cod. R *et est in generato* pro *in generatum*. Paulo post mendum Vat. *ad hunc* loco *ad hoc* correximus ex mss.
[7] Ed. 1 *substantia*. Mox post *suppositum* cod. R *nihil* loco *non*, et paulo infra cod. V *ipsam* praemittit verbo *limitat*.
[8] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *ea* pro *eo*, quo ponitur Vat.
[9] Ope plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 exhibemus *decidendo* loco *descindendo*, quod non ita bene sbunexo verbo *decisa* correspondet. Mox cod. T *causa transmutabilitatis* pro *cum transmutatione*.
[10] Nempe: conservatione passive sumta. — Antiquam lectionem plurimorum mss. et sex primarum edd. restituimus pro *conversione* ponendo *conservatione* ; utriusque lectionis idem sensus. Pro lectione mss. stat Aristot., II. de Anima, text 47. (c. 4.).
[11] Ita mss. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. hic *id est* pro *ipsam scilicet* habet et mox *ipsum scilicet* praemittit nomini *corpus*.
[12] Consentientibus mss. et ed. 1, commutavimus in hac propositione *Quod* in *Quia* et deinde *quia* in *quod*.
[13] Ed. 1 addit *restauratur vel*.
[14] Cod. bb adiicit *quae est*.
[15] Vat., obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1, *adiunctam*.

---

[1] From the codices and edition 1 we have substituted *in the Divine "Being"* [divino esse] for *among the divine* [in divinis], then we have supplied the particle *And*. Next after *I believe* codices H and I have *that in the divine* [quia in divinis] and edition 1 *that of God* [et Dei] in place of *that every* [quia omnis].
[2] See Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. II, text 34, (ch. 4); Metaphysics, Bk. VII, texts 22 and 28, (Bk. VI, chs. 7 and 8).
[3] The Vatican text together with codex cc, but disagreeing with the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *However to produce a similar to one's self in nature is in a threefold manner* [Sibi vero simili in natura producere tripliciter est] in place of *However, a similar to one's self happens to be produced in a threefold manner* [Sibi vero simili contingit produci tripliciter].
[4] Hence generation is also commonly defined in this respect: an origin of a living by a living as by a principle conjoined in a similitude of nature.
[5] Some codices, such as X and Z, repeat here *in* [in].
[6] Codex R has *and is in the one generated* [et est in generato] for *in the one generated* [in generatum]. A little after this the error of the Vatican text, which has *still* [adhuc] in place of *for this* [ad hoc], we have corrected from the manuscripts.
[7] Edition 1 has *Substance* [substantia]. Then after *Supposit* [suppositum] codex R has *adds nothing* [nihil addit] in place of *does not add* [non addit], and a little below this codex V has *it* [ipsam] at *nor limits*.
[8] Trusting in very many manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *It* [ea] for *Him* [eo], which the Vatican text has.
[9] With the help of very many manuscripts and edition 1 we exhibit *by letting fall off* [decidendo] in place of *by cutting off* [descindendo], which does not correspond so well with the following *fallen off* [decisa]. Then codex T has *on account of transmutability* [causa transmutabilitatis] for *with a transmutation*.
[10] Namely: by a conservation taken in the passive sense. — We have restored the ancient reading of the many manuscripts and of the six first editions by putting *conservation* [conservatione] in place of *conversion* [conversione]; each reading has the same

sense.
[11] Thus the manuscripts together with edition 1, while the Vatican text here has *that is* [id est] for *namely . . . itself* [ipsam scilicet] and then *namely . . . itself* [ipsum scilicet] about the noun *a body* [corpus].
[12] Agreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1, in this proposition we have changed *Because* [Quod] into *Because* [Quia] and then *that* [quia] into *that* [quod].
[13] Edition 1 adds *is restored and/or* [restauratur vel].
[14] Codex bb inserts *which is* [quae est].
[15] The Vatican text, striving against the manuscripts and edition 1, has *adjoined* [adiunctam].

SCHOLION.

I. Obiectiones iam in corp. solutae sunt. Quoad Angelos patet, quod nullam habere possunt generationem: non generationem *imperfectam*, quae est ex *parte*, propter simplicitatem substantiae angelicae; non *perfectam*, quae est ex *toto*, quia eorum natura est finita. — Quoad argumenta congruentiae, quae supposito fidei dogmate hic afferuntur, cfr. supra d. 2. q. 2; d. 5. q. 2; dub. 2. 10. huius d.; Breviloq. p. I. c. 3; Hexaem. Serm. 11. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 42. m. 1. 2. — Scot., I. Sent. d. 2. q. 6. 7. — S. Thom., I. Sent. d. 4. q. 1. a. 1; S. I. q. 27. a. 1. 2; S. c. Gent. IV. c. 10. 11. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 4. a. 3; S. I. tr. 7. q. 30. m. 1. — Petr. a Tar., I. Sent. d. 4. q. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 1. — Aegid. R., I. Sent. d. 4. 1. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 58. q. 1. n. 8-24. — Durand., I. Sent. d. 4. q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., I. Sent. d. 4. q. 1. — Biel, hic q. 1; d. 10. q. 1. prop. 1.

SCHOLIUM

I. The objections have already been solved in the body (of the reply). In regard to the Angels it is clear, that they can have no generation: not the *imperfect* generation, which is out of *a part*, on account of the simplicity of the angelic substance; not the *perfect*, which is out of *the whole*, because their nature is finite. — In regard to the arguments of congruency, which are here brought forward, having supposed the dogma of the Faith, cf. above d. 2, q. 2; d. 5, q. 2; dub. 2 and 10 of this distinction; Breviloquium, p. I, ch. 3; Hexaemeron, Sermon 11. — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 42, m. 1 and 2. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Sent., Bk. I, d. 2, q. 6 and 7. — St. Thomas, Sent., d. 4, q. 1, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 27, a. 1 and 2; Summa contra Gentiles , Bk. IV, c. 10 and 11. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great)., Sent., Bk. I, d. 4, a. 3; Summa., I, tr. 7, q. 30, m. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, Sent., Bk. I, d. 4, q. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here at a. 1, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, Sent., Bk. I, d. 4, 1st princ., q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 58, q. 1, nn. 8-24. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, d. 4, q. 1. — (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian, Sent., Bk. I, d. 4, q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, here at q. 1; d. 10, q. 1, prop. 1.

the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM IX.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 182-184.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION IX

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 182-184.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Quaestio II.

Utrum in divinis generatio distinguat inter gignentem et genitum.

SECUNDO QUAERITUR, utrum generatio in divinis sit peronsarum distinctiva. Et quod sic, ostenditur hoc modo.

1. Augustinus circa principium de Trinitate:[1] « Nulla res est, quae se ipsam gignat, ut sit »: si ergo gignit, aliam gignit; sed inter *aliam* et *aliam* est distinctio: ergo etc.

2. Item, generatio est emanatio; sed ubi est

Question 2

Whether generation among the divine distinguishes between the One begetting and the One begotten.

SECOND THERE IS ASKED, whether generation among the divine is distinctive of the Persons. And that it is, is shown in this manner.

1. (St.) Augustine (says) near the beginning of On the Trinity:[1] « There is no thing, which begets its very self, to be »: if therefore it does beget, it begets another; but between *one* and an *other* is a distinction: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, generation is an emanation; but

emanatio, ibi est multiplicatio sive plurificatio; ubi autem multiplicatio, ibi[2] distinctio: ergo ubi generatio, ibi necessario est distinctio.

where there is emanation, there is multiplication or plurification; moreover where (there is) multiplication, there[2] is distinction: therefore where (there is) generation, there necessarily is distinction.

3. Item, generatio in divinis est relatio;[3] sed relatio importat respectum et ordinem; sed ubi respectus et ordo, ibi suppositorum et relatorum sive ordinatorum distinctio: et sic etc.

3. Likewise, generation among the divine is a relation;[3] but relation introduces respect and order; but where (there is) respect and order, there (is) a distinction of supposits and of (things) related or ordained: and so etc..

4. Item, maior[4] diversitas sustinetur a supposito vel in supposito composito et multiplici quam in subiecto simplici et uniformi; sed relative opposita non stant insimul in eodem individuo creato: ergo nec in simplici hypostasi. *Probatio mediae*. Bene sequitur: Socrates est pater Platonis: ergo non est filius eius, vel est distinctus ab eo: ergo multo fotius in divinis.

4. Likewise, greater[4] diversity is sustained by a supposit and/or in a composed and multiform supposit than in a simple and uniform subject; but opposites do not stand in a relative manner at the same time [insimul] in the same individual created (thing): therefore neither in a simple hypostasis. *A proof of the middle*. Well does it follow: 'Socrates is the father of Plato: therefore he is not his son, and/or he is distinct from [ab] him': therefore much more strongly (does it follow) among the divine.

Contra: 1. Pater generando Filium dat ei totum quod habet; sed habet essentiam et personam: ergo dat ei essentiam et personam: ergo sicut Filius non distinguitur a Patre essentialiter, ita nec personaliter, ut videtur.

On the contrary: 1. The Father by generating the Son gives to Him the whole (of) what He has; but He has an essence and a person: therefore He gives to Him an essence and a person: therefore just as the Son is not distinguished from [a] the Father essentially, so neither personally, as it seems.

2. Item, Pater communicat Filio essentiam suam propter summam[5] simplicitatem; sed aeque simplex est persona ut essentia: ergo qua ratione communicat essentiam, communicat et personam.

2. Likewise, the Father communicates to the Son His own Essence on account of the[5] most high simplicity; but equally simple is (His) Person as (is His) Essence: therefore by the reckoning by which He communicates the Essence, He communicates (His) Person.

3. Item, in Patre idem est natura et persona: ergo impossible est, quod communicet unum, quod non[6] communicet aliud, ergo si dat naturam, et personam.

3. Likewise, in the Father the same (thing) is the Nature and the Person: therefore it is impossible, that He communicate the One, (and) that He not communicate the Other, therefore if He gives the Nature, (He) also (gives) the Person.

4. Item, videtur quod relatio non distinguat

4. Likewise, it seems that relation does not

aliqua[7] ratione, quia unus et idem punctus est principium et finis respectu diversarum linearum: ergo si istae relationes non sunt disctintivae, videtur similiter, quod nec paternitas et filiatio. *Si dicas*, quod non omnes relationes distinguunt, sed solum mutuae, ut principium et principiatum, finis et finitum; *contra*:[8] Pater et Filius se habent, sicut intelligens et intellectum, ut dicit Anselmus;[9] sed idem potest esse intelligens et intellectum: ergo etc.

distinguish by any[7] reckoning, because one and the same point is the beginning and the end in regard to [in respectu] diverse lines: therefore if those relations are not distinctive, it seems similarly, that neither (are) paternity and filiation. *If you say*, that not all relations distinguish, but only mutual ones, as ‘the beginning and the begun’, ‘the end and the ended’; *on the contrary*:[8] the Father and the Son hold themselves, just as the one understanding and one understood (do), as (St.) Anselm says;[9] but the same can be understanding and understood: ergo etc.

5. Item, maior est repugnantia in contrariis quam in relativis;[10] sed albedo et nigredo, quae sunt contraria, non faciunt distinctionem circa Petrum, quia idem potest modo esse albus, modo niger: ergo multo fortius unus in divinis modo erit Pater modo Filius.

5. Likewise, greater is the repugnance in contraries than in relatives;[10] but whiteness and blackness, which are contraries, do not cause [faciunt] a distinction in [circa] Peter, because the same can now be white, now black: therefore much more strongly one, among the divine, will not be now Father, now Son.

6. Item, *quaeritur*, quare potius relationes faciunt distinctionem personae quam essentiae, cum aeque bene possint esse plures essentiae vel naturae in una persona, sicut e converso.

6. Likewise, *it is asked*, why do relations cause a distinction of person rather than of essence, since there can equally well be more essences and/or natures in one person, as conversely?

---

[1] Libr. I. d. 1. n. 1. — Circa finem argumenti fide multorum mss. et ed. 1 post *inter aliam* expunximus *rem*.
[2] Vat. adiungit *et*.
[3] Cod. Y addit *in creaturis vero actio vel mutatio*.
[4] Multi codd. ut A C G K O R S U V Y etc. cum sex primis edd. *minor*, sed mendose. Paulo infra ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *subiecto* pro *substantia* et *relative* pro *relativa*. — Sensus argumenti est: Suppositum creatum et compositum est capax ad *maiorem* diversitatem sustinendam, quam increatum et simplex; sed in creato supposito non est capacitas ad *simul* sustinenda relative opposita; ergo multo minus in simplici supposito etc.
[5] In mss. et ed. 1 deest *suam*, quod Vat. hic addit. Mox Vat. cum codd. cc contra alios codd. et ed. 1 *et* pro *ut*.
[6] Sequimur vetustiores codd. cum ed. 1 ponendo *quod non* loco *quin*. Cod. Z brevius *unum sine altero*.
[7] Multi codd. ut A C L O P Q R S T U V Y etc. cum ed. 1 *alia* loco *aliqua*, sed, ut videtur, minus bene, etiamsi sub *alia ratione* intelligas modum distinguendi relativis proprium, quia, uti ex subnexis patet, agitur de eo, quod relatio simpliciter non distinguat. Cod. Z *nisi* pro *aliqua*.
[8] Cod. Y addit *videtur quod nec mutuae quia*. Mox Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis tamen codd. renitentibus, *ut*

[1] Book I, d. 1, n. 1. — Near the end of this argument, trusting in many manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the *thing* [rem] after *between one* [inter aliam].
[2] The Vatican text adjoins an *also* [et].
[3] Codex Y adds *but in creatures action and/or mutation*.
[4] Many codices, such as A C G K O R S U V Y etc., together with the six first editions have *less* [minor], but faultily. A little below this from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *subject* [subiecto] for *substance* [substantia] and *in a relative manner* [relative] for *relative* [relativa]. — The sense of the argument is: A created and composite supposit is capable of sustaining *more* diversity, than the uncreated and simple one; but in a created supposit there is not a capacity to sustain *together* [simul] opposites in a relative manner; therefore much less so in a simple supposit etc. [5] In the manuscripts and edition 1 there is lacking the *His* [suam] which the Vatican text adds here. Then the Vatican text together with codex cc, contrary to the other codices and edition 1, has *abd* [et] for *as* [ut].
[6] We follow the older codices together with edition 1 by putting *(and) that He not* [quod non] in place of *(and) that He not* [quin]. Codex Z more breifly has *the one without the other* [unum sine altero].

pro *sicut*.
[9] Monolog. c. 32, ubi hoc quoad sensum invenitur.
[10] Cfr. Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Oppositis.

[7] Many codices, such as A C L O P Q R S T U V Y etc, together with edition 1 read *another* [alia] in place of *any* [aliqua], but, as is seen, less well, even if under *by another reckoning* [aliqua ratione] you understand the manner of distinguishing proper to relatives, because, as is clear from what follows, it concerns this, that relation does not distinguish simply. Codex Z has *except by a reckoning* [nisi ratione] for *by any reckoning* [aliqua ratione].
[8] Codex Y adds *it seems that neither (do) mutual ones, because* [videtur quod nec mutuae quia]. Then the Vatican text, together with codex cc, with, however, the others disagreeing, has *as* [ut] for *just as* [sicut].
[9] Monologion, ch. 32, where this is found according to its sense.
[10] Cf. Aristotle, On Predicaments, ch. " On Opposites ".

CONCLUSIO.

Contra Sabellium probatur, quod generatio in divinis facit realem distinctionem inter generantem et genitum; contra Arium vero, quod haec distinctio sit quantum ad personam, non quantum ad essentiam.

CONCLUSION

Against Sabellius it is proved, that generation among the divine causes a real distinction between the One generating and the One begotten; on the other hand against Arius, that this distinction is as much as regards the Person, not as much as regards the Essence.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod generatio in divinis, sicut ostensum est,[1] facit realem distinctionem inter generantem et generatum, non rationalem vel intellectualem solum, sicut dixit Sabellius; et[2] realem quantum ad *personam*, non quantum ad *essentiam*, sicut dixit Arius.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that generation among the divine, just as has been shown,[1] causes a real distinction between the One generating and the One generated, not only a rational and/or intellectual one, as Sabellius has said; and[2] a real one 'as much as regards *person*', not 'as much as regards *essence*', as Arius has said.

Quod sic patet. Generatio in creaturis dicit emanationem per modum *actionis* sive mutationis, in Deo[3] emanationem per modum *relationis*.

Which is thus clear. Generation in creatures means an emanation through a manner of *action* [actionis] or of *mutation* [mutationis], in[3] God (it means) an emanation through a manner of *relation*.

In quantum *emanatio*, dicit *aliquam* distinctionem; in quantum *talis* emanatio, dicit distinctionem in *persona*.[4] Ratione *emanationis* est *distinctio*; quia, sicut dicit Anselmus,[5] « nec intellectus capit, nec natura permittit, illum, qui est ab alio, esse illum, a quo est », secundum quod positive dicitur aliquis esse ab alio — nam Pater

Inasmuch as (it is) an *emanation*, it means *some* distinction; inasmuch as (it is) *such* an emanation, it means a distinction in *person*.[4] By reason of *emanation* there is a *distinction*; because, just as (St.) Anselm says,[5] « neither does understanding [intellectus] grasp, nor does nature permit, that that, which is from [ab] another, be

privative dicitur esse a se, id est non ab alio. In quantum *talis* emanatio, ponit distinctionem in *persona*. Generatio enim est productio convenientis in natura; ratione[6] *naturae* non potest esse distinctio: ergo vel erit ratione *suppositi*, vel *proprietatis*. Si *proprietatis*, aut absolute, aut respective; non *absolute*, quia tunc esset distinctio in natura; nec[7] *respective*, ut puta relationis, quia in relatione secundum se non est motus in creaturis[8] nec origo in divinis; unde filiatio non generatur nisi in alio. Ergo necesse est, quod sit distinctio in *supposito*.

that, from which it is », according to which something is positively said to be from another — for the Father is privatively said to be from Himself, that is, not from another. Inasmuch as (it is) *such* an emanation, it posits a distinction in *person*. For generation is a production of one convening [convenientis] in nature; by reason[6] of the *Nature* there cannot be a distinction: therefore it shall be by reason of a *supposit*, and/or of a *property*. If of a *property*, either absolutely, or respectively; not *absolutely*, because then there would be a distinction in the Nature; nor[7] *respectively*, considered [puta] as (belonging) to a relation, because in a relation according to itself there is no movement [non est motus] in creatures[8] nor origin among the divine; whence filiation is not generated except in another. Therefore it is necessary, that the distinction be in a *supposit*.

Similiter ratione *relationis* est distinctio, quia nihil ad se refertur nec ordinatur. Ratione vero *talis* relationis est distinctio *personalis*; quia *generare* et *generari*, cum dicant relationem per modum actionis et passionis,[9] dicunt eam in supposito et respectu suppositi. Et ideo, quia relatio inter extrema notat distinctionem, patet quod distinctio est ibi suppositorum. His visis,[10] facile est solvere ad obiecta.

Similarly by reason of *relation* there is a distinction, because nothing is referred or ordained to itself [ad se]. However, by reason of *such* a relation there is a *personal* distinction; because *to generate* and *to be generated*, since they mean relation through a manner of action and passion,[9] mean this [eam] in a supposit and in respect of a supposit. And for that reason, because a relation between extremes notes a distinction, it is clear that the distinction there belongs to the supposits. With these things seen,[10] it is easy to solve for the objections [ad obiecta].

1. Quod ergo obiicitur: Pater communicat Filio totum quod habet; verum est, praeter generationem et generationis distinctionem; ipsa enim *ratio communicandi* dat intelligere distinctionem, quia nullus communicat sibi, sed alii; et ideo[11] id in quo distinguit, non communicat.

1. What therefore is objected: 'the Father communicates to the Son the whole which He has'; is true, except [praeter] generation and the distinction of generation; for the *reckoning of communicating* itself gives one to understand a distinction, because no one communicates to himself, but to another; and for that reason that in which it distinguishes, He[11] does not communicate.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod aeque simplex est persona, ut essentia; dicendum, quod simplicitas essentiae est, quod sit in pluribus; sed simplicitas suppositi est, quod non sit in[12] pluribus. Nam suppositum sive

2. To that which is objected, that equally simple is "person", as "essence"; it must be said, that there is a simplicity of essence, because it is in many; but there is a simplicity of supposit, because it is not in[12]

individuum, quantum est de se, dicitur quod est in uno solo; ideo non est simile.

many. For "supposit" or "individual", as much as it is of itself [de se], is said because it is in one alone; for that reason it is not similar.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod idem est essentia et persona; dicendum, quod quamvis sint idem, non tamen sunt *ad idem*: quia persona est ad alium, ideo generatur[13] et refertur; essentia vero non, ideo essentia communicatur et persona distinguitur. Sicut ergo, quamvis idem sit in Patre essentia et persona, tamen persona generat, essentia non; sic e converso essentia communicatur et persona non.

3. To that which is objected, that the same thing [idem] is the Essence and the Person; it must be said, that although they are the same thing, they are not, however, *for the same thing* [ad idem]: because the Person is for an Other, for that reason (the Other) is generated[13] and is referred; the Essence, on the other hand, not (so), for that reason the Essence is communicated and the Person is distinguished. Just as, therefore, although the same thing in the Father is Essence and Person, however the Person generates, the Essence (does) not; so conversely the Essence is communicated and the Person is not.

4, Ad illud quod obiicitur de principio et fine in puncto, patet responsio, quia illae non sunt *mutuae* relationes, quod propriet requiritur ad distinctionem; unde non valet. Quod *obiicit*[14] *de intelligente et intellecto*, dico quod non est ibi relatio secundum *esse*, sed secundum *dici*. Ad hoc autem quod relatio distinguat, oportet quod sint relationes mutuae, quia aliter non distinguunt; oportet etiam, quod dicant relationem secundum *esse*.

4. To that which is objected of the beginning and end in a point, the response is clear, that those are not *mutual* relations, which properly is required for a distinction; whence it is not valid. What *it objects*[14] *concerning One understanding and One understood*, I say that there is not a relation there according to "*being"* [secundum esse], but according to *being said* [secundum dici]. For this, moreover, that a relation distinguishes, it is proper that the relations be mutual, because otherwise they do not distinguish; it is proper also, that they mean a relation according to "*being*" [esse].

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur de albedine et nigredine, dicendum, quod nulla est oppositio formarum, nisi considerentur[15] respectu eiusdem temporis; et impossibile est, quod idem subiectum eodem tempore sit album et nigrum; relationes autem in divinis simul sunt.

5. To that which is objected concerning whiteness and blackness, it must be said, that there is no opposition of forms, except (those) considered[15] in respect of the same time; and it is impossible, that the same subject at the same time be white and black; but relations among the divine are simultaneous [simul].

6. Ad illud quod ultimo *quaeritur*, quare magis relationes faciunt[16] distinctionem in personis quam in essentia; patet ex iam dictis responsio. Potest etiam alia ratio reddi, quia pluralitas naturarum impedit / simplicitatem personae,

6. To that which is last *asked*, why relations cause[16] a distinction in persons rather than in an essence; the response is clear from what has already been said. Any relation can also be returned [reddi], because a plurality of natures impedes / the simplicity of person,

[1] Hic in fundam.
[2] Vat. contra mss. et sex primas edd. *sed* loco *et*, ac paulo post *dicit* pro *dixit*. Cod. M *accidentalem* loco *intellectualem*.
[3] Cod. bb addit *autem*.
[4] Praeclaram hanc emendationem debemus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, dum Vat. verba *in quantum* usque *Ratione* omittit, mutata insuper interpunctione. Nonnuli codd. *autem* praemittunt voci *talis*.
[5] De Process. Spir. S. c. 3: Quippe nec natura permittit nec intellectus capit, existentem de aliquo esse de quo existit, aut de quo existit esse existentem de se. — Cfr. etiam Monolog. c. 38.
[6] Vat. contra mss. et sex primas edd. addit *igitur*, pro quo codd. aa bb incongrue ponunt *enim*.
[7] Ed. 1 *non*.
[8] Vide Aristot., V. Phys. text. 10. (c. 2).
[9] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *et passionis*, qui et bis pro plurali ponunt singularem numerum *dicat* et *dicit*. — Cfr. Aristot., V Metaph. text. 20. (IV. c. 15.), ubi tres species relationis, inter quas est *actio et passio*, afferunutr.
[10] Vat. cum paucis codd. incongrue et contra alios codd. et ed. 1 hic addit *patet*, moxque omittit *est*. Nonnulli codd. *respondere* pro *solvere*.
[11] Supple: Pater. — Cod. R et ed. 1 clarius *distinguitur* loco *distinguit*. [Tr. — Melius tamen ut clausa subordinativa legatur cum subiecto diverso, *ratio communicandi* quam *Pater*.] Paulo ante cod. N post *sibi* addit *ipsi*.
[12] Multi codd. ut B D E S V X Y Z aa bb cum ed. 1 *ex* loco *in*, sed falso, ut patet ex contextu. Mox post *dicitur* fide anitiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 *expunximus esse*.
[13] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et sex primarum edd. *generat*.
[14] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 *obicitur*. Cod. Y particulam *Et* praemittit relativo *quod*.
[15] Cod. R adiungit *secundum idem*.
[16] Cod. Y *faciant*.

[1] Here in the fundament [Tr. Note: the marginal note specifies this as the quote from St. Augustine in n. 1 of the demonstration.].
[2] The Vatican text, contrary to the manuscripts and the six first editions, has *but* [sed] in place of *and* [et], and a little after this *says* [dicit] for *said* [dixit]. Codex M has *accidental* [accidentalem] in place of *intellectual* [intellectualem].
[3] Codex bb adds *but* [autem].
[4] This outstanding emendation we own to the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, while the Vatican text omits the words *inasmuch as* [in quantum] up to *By reason* [Ratione], having changed also the punctuation. Not a few codices have *but inasmuch as such* [in quantum autem talis].
[5] On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, ch. 3: Indeed neither does nature permit, nor does understanding [intellectus] grasp, that one existing from [de] anything be from that which it exists, or from that which exists that there be one existing from itself. — Cf. also Monologion, ch. 38.
[6] The Vatican text, contrary to the manuscripts and the six first editions adds *therefore* [igitur], for which codices aa and bb incongruously put *for* [enim].
[7] Edition 1 has *not* [non].
[8] See Aristotle, Physics, Bk. V, text 10, (ch. 2).
[9] Very many codices together with edition 1 omit *and passion* [et passionis], which also twice instead of the plural put the singular *mean* [dicat] and *mean* [dicit]. — Cf. Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. V, text 20, (Bk. IV, ch. 15), where there are brought forward three species of relation, among which is *action and passion*.
[10] The Vatican text, together with a few of the codices, incongruously and contrary to the other codices and edition 1, here adds *it is clear* [patet], and then omits *is* [est]. Not a few codices have *respond* [respondere] for *solve* [solvere].
[11] Supply: Father. — Codex R and edition 1 have more clearly *is distinguished* [distinguitur] for *distinguishes* [distinguit]. [Tr. Note: However, the subject of the subordinate clause is better read diversely from that of the main sentence, as *the reckoning of communicating* rather than *the Father*.] A litte before this codex N reads *to his very self* [sibi ipsi] for *to himself* [sibi].
[12] Many codices, such as B D E S V X Y Z aa bb together with edition 1 have *out of* [ex] in place of *in* [in], but falsely, as is clear from the context. Then after *is said* [dicitur], trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have expunged *to be* [esse].
[13] The Vatican text, without the authority of the manuscripts and of the six first edition has *generates* [generat].
[14] The Vatican text, contrary to the testimony of [praeter fidem] the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, 6 has *is objected* [obiicitur]. Codex Y prefaces *And* [Et] to the relative *What* [Quod].
[15] Codex R adjoins *according to the same thing* [secundum idem].
[16] Codex Y read in the subjunctive: *cause* [faciant].

simplicitatem personae, sed non sic e converso. Quod patet sic: si[1] plures naturae sunt in una persona, aut ergo per gratiam, aut per naturam. Si per *gratiam unionis*, sic — quia natura unita consequitur unitatem personae — non impedit;[2] sed si *naturaliter*, ut in *Petro*, est pluralitas essentiarum sive naturarum, tunc — cum intellectus naturae praecedat personam, et non natura ex personis, sed persona ex naturis sit[3] — necesse est, personam esse compositam; et inde est, quod in divinis magis est unitas naturae cum pluralitate personarum, quam e converso.

the simplicity of a person, but not so conversely. Which is thus clear: if[1] there are many natures in one person, either, therefore, (they are) through grace, or through nature. If through the *grace of union*, thus — because the united nature follows after [consequitur] the unity of the Person — it does not impede (simplicity);[2] but if *naturally*, as in *Peter*, there is a plurality of essences or of natures, then — since the understanding [intellectus] of nature precedes the person, and (since) a nature is not out of persons, but a person out of natures[3] — it is necessary, that the person be composite; and hence it is, that among the divine there is a unity of Nature with a plurality of Persons, rather than the other way around [magis quam e converso].

SCHOLION.

I. Duae haereses Sabellii et Arii, Symbolo Nicaeno aliisque Ecclesiae decretis reprobatae, duplici conclusionis propositione refelluntur.

Quoad distinctiones relationis in solut. ad 4. notandum, quod relativa secundum *dici* ea sunt, quae in principali signifcato non important relationem, sed aliquid absolutum, quod tamen secundario involvit relationem ad aliud, ut scientia ad obiectum, i. e. scibile; ita Brulifer ad hunc locum. Vel clarius cum Goudin (Philos. Logica Maior. p. I. disp. 2. q. 4.): « Relatio secundum *dici* non est aliquid pure relativum, sed res *quaedam absoluta, quam consequitur habitudo ad aliam*, adeo ut exprimi non possit, quin et illa habitudo exprimatur . . . sic pars, etsi sit aliquid absolutum, includit tamen habitudinem ad totam, scientia ad obiectum ». Quid sit relatio *mutua*, non eget explicatione. Plura vide infra d. 30. q. 3. Scholion.

SCHOLIUM

I. The two heresies of Sabellius and Arius reproved by the Nicene Creed and the other decrees of the Church, are refuted by the twofold conclusion of the proposition.

In regard to the distinctions of relation in the solution to n. 4, it must be noted, that relatives according to a *being said* [secundum dici] are those, which in the principle (thing) signified, do not convey a relation, but something absolute, which, however, secondarily involve a relation to an other, as a science to its object, i. e. the knowable; thus Brulifer on this passage. And/or more clearly with Goudin (Philos. Logica Maior., p. I, disp. 2, q. 4): « A relation according to a *being said* is not something purely relative, but a *certain absolute* thing, *which a habitude toward an other follows after*, to this extent that it cannot be expressed, and that habitude also is not expressed . . . as a part, even though it be something absolute, it nevertheless includes a habitude toward the whole, as a science does to its object ». What is a *mutual* relation, does not need explaining. See more below at d. 30, q. 3, in the Scholium.

II. Cfr. supra d. 5. per totam. — Scot., d. 11. a. 2; d. 26. q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1; S. I. q. 28. a. 1. 3; S. c. Gent. IV. c. 14. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 26. a. 7; d. 9. a. 4. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1. — Richard. a. Med., hic a. 1. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princc. q. 1. et 2. — Durand., hic. q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. unic.

II. Cf. above d. 5 throughout. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, d. 11, a. 2; d. 26, q. sole. — St. Thomas, here at q. 1, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 28, a. 1 and 3; Summa contra Gentiles, IV, c. 14. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), Sent., Bk. I, d. 26, a. 7; d. 9, a. 4. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here at q. 1, a. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here at a. 1, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here at 1. princ., q. 1 and 2. — Durandus, here at q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here at q. sole.

---

[1] Vat. omittit *si*, quod pauci codd. ut E X Z bene addunt, cum sermo sit ex suppositione. Mox cod. E *eadem* pro *una*.
[2] Cod. X addit *simplicitatem*.
[3] Plurimi codd., mutata interpunctione, cum ed. 1 *sic* pro *sit*, cod. Y *est*; paulo supra plurimi codd. *praecedit* pro *praecedat*. Lectionem tamen cod. I et ed. 1 praeferimus propter congruitatem grammaticalis constructionis. Cod. I post *personis* addit *constet*. Vat. contra vetustiores codd. et ed. 1 perperam *natura* loco *naturis*.

[1] The Vatican text omits *if* [si], which a few codices, such as E X Z well add, since the argument is from a supposition. Then codex E has *the same* [eadem] for *one* [una].
[2] Codex X adds *simplicity* [simiplicitatem].
[3] Very many codices, having changed the punctuation, together with edition 1 have at the end of this clause *thus* [sic] for *is* [sit], codex Y has *is* [est]; a little above this very many codices have the indicative *when . . . precedes* [cum . . . praecedit] for *since . . . precedes* [cum . . . pracedat]. We however prefer the reading of codex I and edition 1 on account of the congruity of the grammatical construction. Codex I after *persons* [personis] adds *is established* [constat]. The Vatican text, contrary to the older codices and edition 1, wrongly has *a nature* [natura] for *natures* [naturis].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION IX

DISTINCTIONEM IX.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

ARTICLE SOLE

Quaestio III.

Question 3

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 184-185.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 184-185.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Quaestio III.

Utrum in divinis generatio sit aeterna.

TERTIO **QUARITUR**, utrum divina generatio sit aeterna. Et quod sic, ostenditur hoc modo.

1. In creaturis operans naturaliter operatur quam citius potest, et de perfectione agentis est, quod citissime possit operari:[4] ergo cum productio Filii a Patre sit per naturam et summam potentiam, quam cito *fuit*, Pater *genuit*; sed fuit ab aeterno: ergo etc.

2. Item, de perfectione generationis est, ut quod generatur aequetur generanti:[5] ergo cum divina generatio sit perfectissima, Filius erit Patri per omnia aequalis; sed Pater est infinitus duratione: ergo et Filius.

3. Item, intelligere se coaeternum est menti divinae; nunquam enim est ponere, quod de non intelligente sit Deus factus intelligens; sed verbum est coaeternum menti intelligenti; ex hoc enim, quod mens se intelligit, verbum gignit. Si ergo propriisime Filius est verbum, est coaeternum Patri; et hoc est quod dicit beatus Ioannes:[6] *In principio erat Verbum*.

Question 3

Whether among the divine generation is eternal.

THIRD **THERE IS ASKED**, whether divine generation is eternal. And that it is [sic], is shown in this manner.

1. In creatures the one working naturally works as swiftly as it can, and it concerns [est de] the perfection of an agent, that it can work in the swiftest manner:[4] therefore since the production of the Son by the Father is through (His) Nature and most high Potency, as soon as He *was*, the Father *begot*; but He was from eternity: ergo etc..

2. Likewise, it concerns the perfection of generation, that what is generated be equated to the one generated:[5] therefore since divine generation is the most perfect, the Son will be equal to the Father in all things [per omnia]; but the Father is infinite in duration: therefore also the Son.

3. Likewise, a coeternal self-understanding [intelligere se coaeternum] belongs to the Divine Mind; for never is it posited, that from One not understanding [de non intelligente] God became One understanding [intelligens]; but a word is coeternal to the mind understanding it; for from this, that the mind understands itself, it begets a word. If, therefore, the Son is most properly a word, He is coeternal to the Father; and this is what blessed John says:[6] *In the beginning was the Word*.

4. Item, hoc[7] idem ostenditur *per impossibile*. Omne quod coepit esse, est mutatum secundum substantiam; sed omne quod incipit generari, incipit esse: ergo omne quod incipit generari, est mutatum secundum substantiam; sed generatio[8] est de substantia generantis: ergo ubi incipit esse generatio, substantia generantis mutatur; sed substantia Dei Patris secundum esse est immutabilis: ergo generatio non incipit in divinis.

4. Likewise, this[7] same (thing) is shown *through the impossible*. Everything which beings to be [coepit esse], has been changed according to substance; but everything which begins [incipit] to be generated, begins to be [incipit esse]: therefore everything which begins to be generated, has been changed according to substance; but generation[8] concerns the substance of the one generating: therefore where generation has begun to be, the substance of the one generating is changed; but the substance of God the Father according to "being" [secundum esse] is immutable: therefore generation does not begin among the divine.

CONTRA: 1. Sicut se habet corruptio ad *non*[9] *esse* ex parte finis, sic generatio ex parte principii; sed omne quod corrumpitur, desinit esse: ergo omne quod generatur, incipit esse; sed nullum tale est aeternum: ergo etc.

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. Just as corruption holds itself to "*non*[9] *being*" [non esse] on part of its end, in the same manner generation on the part of its beginning [principii]; but everything which is corrupted, has ceased to be [desinit esse]: therefore everything which is generated, begins to be; but nothing such is eternal: ergo etc..

2. Item, quidquid producit divina essentia est ipsa[10] posterius tempore, sive duratione: ergo pari ratione quidquid producit divina persona, cum essentia et persona sint idem.

2. Likewise, whatever produces the Divine Essence is posterior in time, or in duration, to it[10]: therefore by an equal reason whatever produces a Divine Person, since the Essence and the Person are the same (thing).

3. Item, in Deo idem est suum esse et sua duratio; sed Filius habet principium essendi: ergo habet principium durationis: sed quod habet principium durandi[11] incipit esse: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, in God the same (thing) is His own "being" [esse] and His own duration; but the Son has a beginning of being [principium essendi]: therefore He has a beginning of duration: but what has a beginning of enduring [durandi][11] begins to be: ergo etc..

---

[4] Vide Aristot., IX Metaph. text. 10. (VIII. c. 5.). — Paulo infra ed. 1 post *et* repetit *per* et cod. T post *genuit* addit *Filium*.
[5] Aristot., IV. Meteor. text. 19. (c. 3.) ait: Perfectum esse id quod tale producere potest, quale ipsum est. Vide et II. de Anima, text. 34. (c. 4.).
[6] Cap. 1, 1.
[7] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *hoc*. — Vide pro hoc et sequenti argumento Aristot., V. Phys. text. 7; I. de Gener. et corrupt. text. 11-23. (c. 3), et II. de Anima, text 34. seqq. (c. 4.).
[8] Cod. T *generatus* pro *generatio* et mox *si* pro *ubi*.
[9] Cod. O omittit *non*, salvo eodem sensu, qui est in

[4] See Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. IX, text 10 (Bk. VIII, ch. 5). — A little below this edition 1 repeats *through* [per] after *and* [et], and codex T after *begot* [genuit] adds *the Son* [Filium].
[5] Aristotle, Meteorology, Bk. IV, text 19 (ch. 3) says: That it is perfect on account that it can produce such as it is itself. See also On the Soul, Bk. II, text 34 (ch. 4).
[6] Jn 1:1.
[7] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have supplied *this* [hoc]. — On this and the following argument see Aristotle, Physics, Bk. V, text 7; On Generation and Corruption, Bk. I, texts 11-23

generationis et corruptionis contrarietate, de qua V. Phys. text. 14, et quae sub alio respectu exprimitur hac formula: Corruptio unius et generatio alterius.
[10] Fide plurimum mss. ut H K Y bb et ed. 1 posuimus ablativum *ipsa* pro *ipsi*.
[11] Praeferimus lectionem nonnullorum mss. ut M P Q pro *essendi* ponentium *duranti*, quia in ipsa et processus et vis argumenti distinctior redditur. Cod. H et ed. 1 ponunt *durationis*; cod. O vero *essendi et durationis*.

(ch. 3), and On the Soul, Bk. II, text 34 ff. (ch. 4).
[8] Codex T has *He has been generated from* [generatus est de] for *generation concerns* [generatio est de], and then *if* [si] for *where* [ubi].
[9] Codex O omits *non* [non] [10] Trusting in many manuscripts, such as H K Y bb and edition 1, we have replaced the dative referring to the Divine Nature, *to it* [ipsi] with the ablative *to it* [ipsa].
[11] We prefer the reading of not a few manuscripts, such as M P Q, which put *of enduring* [durandi] in place of *of being* [essendi], because in this both the progress and the force of the argument is rendered more distinct. Codex H and edition 1 put *of duration* [durationis]; cod. O however *of being and of duration* [essendi et durationis].

p. 185

4. Item, Pater caret principio et caret initio: ergo qua ratione communicat Filio non habere initium, eadem ratione communicat ei non habere principium; aut si non hoc, nec illud.

4. Likewise, the Father lacks a principle [principium] and lacks a beginning [initio]: therefore by that reckoning by which He communicates to the Son not to have a beginning [initium], by the same reckoning He communicates to Him not to have a principle; or if not this, neither that.

CONCLUSIO.

Generatio in divinis est aeterna propter summam generantis fecunditatem et summam geniti aequalitatem et utriusque summam actualitatem.

CONCLUSION

Generation among the divine is eternal on account of the most high fecundity of the One generating and the most high equality of the One begotten, and the most high actuality of each.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod generatio Filii est aeterna tum ratione *generantis*, tum ratione *geniti*: ratione *generantis* propter summam et perfectam fecunditatem, ratione *geniti* propter summam et perfectam aequalitatem; quarum utraque conditio tollit, ne Filius sit posterius[1] Patre, sicut visum est in opponendo. *Alia* ratio est propter summam in *utroque* actualitatem, in qua non distat actus a potentia, nec posse antecedit esse.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that the generation of the Son is eternal both by reason of the *One generating*, and by reason of the *One begotten*: by reason of the *One generating* on account of (His) most high and perfect fecundity, by reason of the *One begotten* on account of (His) most high and perfect equality; each condition of which prevents [tollit], that the Son be in a posterior manner[1] to the Father, just as has been seen in the objection [in opponendo]. *Another* reason is on account of the most high actuality in *each*, in which act does not distance itself [distat] from potency, nor does "to be able" antecede "to be".

1. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod corruptio

1. To that which is objected, that corruption

ponit terminum finalem; dicendum, quod corruptio semper dicit variationem et mutationem, et ita conversionem entis in non esse; et ideo ponit terminum finalem. Sed generatio aliquando dicit mutationem,[2] ut in creaturis, et sic ponit terminum initialem; sed in divinis non dicit mutationem ex non ente, sed emanationem ab ente.

posits a final terminus; it must be said, that corruption always means a variation and mutation, and thus a conversion of a being [entis] into “non being” [non esse]; and for that reason it posits a final terminus. But generation sometimes means a mutation,[2] as in creatures, and in this manner it does posit an initial terminus; but among the divine it does not mean a mutation out of a non-being [non-ente], but an emanation by a being [ab ente].

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod essentia nihil producit nisi ex tempore; dicendum, quod sicut persona producit aliam personam, sic essentia aliam essentiam. Aliam autem essentiam[3] ex se ipsa non producit, cum ipsa sit immultiplicabilis, nec ex alia, quia similiter esset quaerere, unde producit illam aliam; et sic necesse est in productione prima creaturae, quod producat ex nihilo; et omne sic productum habet esse post non esse, et ita initium. Persona autem non de nihilo producit personam; et ideo non facit de non ente ens, et ideo nullum ponit initium talis productio.

2. To that which is objected, that the Essence produces nothing except out of time; it must be said, that just as Person produces another Person, so the Essence another Essence. But it does not produce another Essence[3] out of itself, since it is incapable of being multiplied [immultiplicabilis], nor out of an other, because similarly there would be the asking, whence it produces that other; and so it is necessary in the first production of a creature, that It produce it out of nothing [ex nihilo]; and everything produced in this manner has a "to be" after a "not to be", and thus a beginning [initium]. Moreover a Person produces a Person not from nothing [non de nihilo]; and for that reason It does not make from a non-being a Being [de non ente ens], and for that reason such a production posits no beginning [initium].

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Filius habet principium essendi; dicendum, quod principium dicitur dupliciter,[4] scilicet *originale* et *initiale*. Secundum quod principium dicitur *originaliter*, sic Filius tam quantum ad esse, quam quantum ad durationem habet principium, quia utrumque habet ab alio. Si autem principium dicatur *initium*,[5] sic dico, quod nec habet principium essendi nec durandi. Primum principium non aufert rationem aeterni, secundum vero sic.

3. To that which is objected, that the Son has a beginning of being [principium essendi]; it must be said, that principium is said in a twofold manner,[4] namely an *original* one and an *initial* one. According to which principium is said *originally*, in this manner the Son both as much as regards “being” [esse], as regards duration has a principle, because He has each from the Other. But if principium is said to be a *beginning* [initium],[5] in this manner I say, that He neither has a beginning of being nor of enduring [principium essendi nec durandi]. The first (sense of the word) principium does not take away the reckoning of the eternal, but the second one does.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur[6] ultimo, quare Pater communicat Filio carentiam intii, non

4. To that which is objected[6] last, why does the Father communicate to the Son a lack of

principii; patet iam responsio: quia *temporale* et *aeternum* de necessitate differunt per essentiam, *principium* et *principiatum* non sic; ideo non est simile de hoc et illo. Quia ergo quod habet initium est temporale, quod[7] caret est aeternum; ideo cum Pater et Filius sint unius essentiae, patet etc. *Rursum*, cum habere principium et non habere dicant[8] differentiam personae, et haec est inter Patrem et Filium; ideo sicut Pater non communicat Filio personam, sed tantum naturam sive essentiema, sic communicavit ei *non habere initium*, sed non communicavit *non habere principium*.

a beginning [carentiam initii], (but) not of a principle; the response is already clear: because the *temporal* and the *eternal* of necessity differ through essence, (but) a *principle* and '*that which depends upon a principle*' [principiatum] not so; for that reason of this and that (the argument) is not similar. Therefore, because what has a beginning [initium] is temporal, what lacks it[7] is eternal; for that reason since the Father and the Son are of the One Essence, it is clear etc.. *Again*, since to have a principle and to not have one mean[8] a difference of Person, and there is this (difference) between the Father and the Son; for that reason just as the Father does not communicate (His) Person to the Son, but only (His) Nature or Essence, so He communicates to Him *to not have a beginning*, but He does not communicate *not to have a principle*.

SCHOLION.

I. Conclusio est de fide, definita in Nicaeno contra Arianos. — Rationes pro conclusione in responsione breviter allatae explicantur argumento 1. et 2. in fundam. — Quoad *aeternitatem* cfr. infra d. 31. a. 1. q. 3. et IV. Sent. d. 3. p. II. a. 3. q. 1. ad 1; I. Sent. d. 40. a. 2. q. 1. ad 4; d. 41. a. 2. q. 1. ad 4.

II. Quoad conclusionem: Scot., hic et Report. q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 2. a. 1; S. I. q. 42. a. 2; S. c. Gent. IV. c. 11. — B. Albert., hic a. 5. 6. 7. — Petr. a. Tar., hic q. 3. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 1. Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 58. q. 1. n. 22. 23. — Durand., hic q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et seq. hic q. unic. — Biel, hic q. 3.

SCHOLIUM

I. The conclusion is *de fide*, defined at Nicea against the Arians. — The reasons in favor of the conclusion, brought forward briefly in the Response, are explained in argument 1 and 2 in the fundament. — In regard to *eternity*, cf. below d. 31, a. 1, q. 3, and Sent. Bk. IV, d. 3, p. II, a. 3, q. 1, at n. 1; Sent., Bk. I, d. 40, q. 2, q. 1, at n. 4; d. 41, a. 2, q. 1, at n. 4.

II. In regard to the conclusion: (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here and in Reportatio, q. sole. — St. Thomas, here at q. 2, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 42, a. 2; Summa contra Gentiles, IV, c. 11. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), here at a. 5, 6 and 7. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here at q. 3, a. 1. — Richard of Middleton, here at a. 2, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here 2nd princ., q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 58, q. 1, n. 22 and 23. — Durandus, here at q. 2. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, on this and the following, here at the question sole. — (Gabriel) Biel, here at q. 3.

---

[1] Ed. 1 *posterior*.
[2] Cod. bb addit *ex non ente*, quod subnexis correspondet.

[1] Edition 1 reads *be posterior to the Father* [sit poterior Patre].
[2] Codex bb adds *out of a non-being* [ex non ente],

[3] Praestamus lectionem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1, quae concinnior est lectione Vat. *Aliam autem naturam essentia*. Vat. et paulo infra minus distincte exhibet *immutabilis* loco *immultipilicabilis*; cum Vat. consentit cod. cc, eo excepto, quod pro *naturam* ponat *creaturam*. Mox cod. R *produce et* loco *producit*.
[4] Vat. minus bene contra mss. et ed. 1 *duplex*. — Plura de notione *principii* vide infra d. 29. a. 1. q. 1. et 2.
[5] Cod. bb *initialiter*.
[6] Nonnulli codd. ut F H K cum ed. 1 *quaeritur*.
[7] Cod. Y addit *eo*.
[8] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et trium primarum edd. *dicat*.

which corresponds with what is subjoined.
[3] We offer the reading of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, which is more elegant than the reading of the Vatican text, *But the Essence does not produce another Nature* [Aliam autem naturam essentia]. The Vatican text also a little below this less distinctly exhibits *immutable* [immutabilis] in place of *incapable of being multiplied* [immultiplicabilis]; with the Vatican text codex cc consent, except for this, that for *nature* [Naturam] it puts *creature* [creaturam]. Then codex R has *do you produce even* [produce et] in place of *does it produce* [producit].
[4] The Vatican text less well, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, has *a twofold principle is meant* [principium dicitur duplex]. — For more on the notion of *principle* see below in d. 29, a. 1, q. 1 and 2.
[5] Codex bb has *initially* [initialiter].
[6] Not a few codices, such as F H K together with edition 1, have *is asked* [quaeritur].
[7] Codex Y adds *it* [eo].
[8] The Vatican text, not trusting in the manuscripts and the three first editions, has *means* [dicat].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM IX.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio IV.

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION IX

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 4

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S.**

Quaestio IV.

Utrum generatio Filii terminata sit.

QUARTO ET ULTIMO quaeritur, utrum generatio Filii sit terminata. Et quod sic, videtur.

1. Augustinus in libro octoginta trium Quaestionem:[9] « Qui semper nascitur nunquam est natus, ac per hoc nunquam est filius ». Nullus ergo per generationem dicendus est filius, quousque generatio / sit terminata;

[9] Quaest. 37: Qui semper nascitur non dum est natus; et nunquam natus est aut natus erit, si semper nascitur. Aliud / est enim nasci, aliud natum esse. Ac per hoc nunquam Filius, si nunquam natus. — Mox cod. I *Nunquam* pro *Nullus*, et cod. S *enim* pro *ergo*.

Question 4

Whether the generation of the Son has been terminated.

FOURTH AND LAST there is asked, whether of the Son has been terminated. And it seems that (it is) so:

1. (St.) Augustine (says) in the eightieth book of On the Three Questions:[9] « Who is always being born [nascitur], has never been born, and through this there is never a son ». No one, therefore, through generation is to be called a son, until the generation / has been terminated;

[9] Question 37: Who is always being born [nascitur], has not yet been born; and he never has been born or will have been born, if he is always being born. For it / is one (thing) to be born, another to have been born. And through this never (would there be) a Son, if He (had) never been born. — Then codex I has *Never* [Nunquam] for *No one* [Nullus], and codex S *for* [enim] for *therefore* [ergo].

p. 186

sit terminata; sed Verbum Patris recte dicitur perfectus Filius: ergo eius generatio est terminata.

2. Item, *ratione* ostenditur sic: *produci* terminatur ad *productum esse*, ergo *generari* ad *generatum esse*; sed Filius Dei est generatus et natus: ergo eius productio sive generatio est terminata.

has been terminated; but the Word of the Father is rightly said to be the perfect Son: therefore His generation has been terminated.

2. Likewise, it is shown *by reason* thus: "*to be produced*" is terminated at the "*to have been produced*", therefore "*to be generated*" at the "*to have been generated*"; but the Son of God has been generated and born: therefore His production or generation has been

terminated.

3. Item, nobilius est *esse generatum* quam *generari*, quia generari est via ad generatum esse, et non e converso; sed quod nobilius est Deo est attribuendum: ergo magis debet ei attribui generatum esse quam generari: ergo generatio Filii dicitur in terminatione.

3. Likewise, it is more noble *to have been generated* than *to be generated*, because "to be generated" is a way toward "to have been generated", and not conversely; but what is more noble must be attributed to God: therefore "to have been generated" out to be attributed to Him rather than "*to be generated"*: therefore the generation of the Son is meant in (its) termination.

4. Item, in[1] generatione, quae semper est in generando, semper aliquid vel aliquis producitur; sed non producitur id quod productum est, secundum id quod est productum: ergo oportet, vel quod iteretur, vel quod succedat generatum in tali genreatione; sed in Filio Dei nec est succesio nec[2] iteratio: ergo nec continua generatio: ergo Filii Dei generatio est terminata.

4. Likewise, in[1] a generation, which is always in one to be generated [generando], something and/or someone is always being produced [producitur]; but that which has been produced is not produced, according to that which has been produced: therefore it is proper, that it be repeated [iteretur], and/or that the one generated succeed in such a generation; but in the Son of God there is neither succession nor iteration:[2] therefore neither a continuous generation: therefore the generation of the Son of God has been terminated.

CONTRA: 1. Damascenus:[3] « Deus, infinite et sine tempore ens, infinite et inquiescibiliter generat »: ergo generatio nunquam terminatur.

ON THE CONTRARY: 1. (St. John) Damascene (says):[3] « God, being [ens] both infinitely and without time, and infinitely in a restless manner [inquiescibiliter], generates »: therefore the generation is never terminated.

2. Item, *ratione* videtur hoc idem posse monstrari. Aeternum non habet se aliter nunc quam prius, sed semper omnino uniformiter: ergo si semper Pater a principio[4] generat, adhuc generat; alioquin aliter se haberet nunc quam prius, et ita generatio aeterna mutaretur.

2. Likewise, it seems that this same (argument) can be shown by *reason*. The Eternal does not hold Himself now otherwise than before, but always in an entirely uniform manner [omnino uniformiter]: therefore if the Father from the beginning [a principio] generates,[4] He is still generating [generat]; otherwise He would hold Himself now in another manner than before, and thus the eternal generation would be changed.

3. Item, simplex[5] et infinitum caret omni termino; sed generatio Filii est simplex et infinita: ergo generatio Filii caret omni termino. Quod sit infinita, patet, quia Filius est infinitus, et iterum ipsa generatio est aeterna, et aeternum est duratione infinitum.

3. Likewise, the simple[5] and the infinite lack every terminus; but the generation of the Son is simple and infinite: therefore the generation of the Son lacks every terminus. That it be infinite, it is clear, because the Son is infinite, and again that generation is eternal, and the eternal is infinite in

duration.

4. Item, perfectior est potentia semper actui coniuncta, quam quae non semper: ergo perfectior est fecunditas semper actui generationis coniuncta, maxime cum fecunditas generandi non perdatur, sed perficiatur:[6] si ergo in Deo est fecunditas perfecta, semper ergo generat; sed non generat alium nisi Filium: ergo Filius semper generatur.

4. Likewise, more perfect is the potency always conjoined to act, than that which is not always: therefore more perfect is the fecundity always conjoined to the act of generation, most of all since the fecundity of generating is not lost, but is accomplished [perficiatur]:[6] if therefore in God there is a perfect fecundity, He therefore always generates; but He does not generate an other except the Son: therefore the Son is always being generated [generatur].

CONCLUSIO.

Generatio divina dicenda est terminata, quatenus hoc vocabulum excludit imperfectionem, interminata vero, quatenus excludit durationem.

CONCLUSION

The Divine Generation must be said to be "terminated", insofar as this word excludes imperfection, but not terminated, insofar as it excludes duration.

R**ESPONDEO**: Ad praedictorum intelligentiam notandum, quod *quaedam* sunt, in quibus idem est *esse* et *factum esse*, differt tamen *fieri* et *esse*, ut sunt illa, quorum esse est permanens nec dependet omnino a principio producente,[7] immo habent rationem subsistendi aliquam intra se, sive per principia propria sive subiecti, ut substantiae et accidentia innata. *Quaedam* sunt, in quibus differt *esse* et *factum esse*, idem tamen est *fieri* et *esse*, ut sunt successiva, quorum esse dependet omnino a principio producente existente in sua actualitate, ut sunt motus et mutationes. *Quaedam* sunt, in quibus est idem *fieri* et *esse* et *factum esse*, ut sunt illa, quae habent esse permanens et totaliter dependent a principio producente, existente in sua actualitate per eundem modum, per quem in principio,[8] non tantum in se, sed etiam respectu producti, ita quod consimilis modus actualitatis attendatur quantum ad utrumque; et talia sunt influentiae sive coporales sive spirituales. Unde Augustinus octavo super Genesim ad litteram[9] dicit, quod lumen semper nascitur et, dum nascitur, est, unde aër semper est illuminatus et semper illuminatur. Similiter omnino dicit[10] de lumine spirituali, quod est

I **RESPOND**: For an understanding of the aforesaid it must be noted, that there are *certain things* [quaedam], in which it is the same *to be* and *to have been made*, and yet (in which) *to be made* and *to be* differ, as are those, whose *to be* is permanent and does not depend entirely on a producing principle,[7] nay they have some reason to subsist within themselves, either through their own principles or (those) of (their) subject, such as substances and innate accidents. There are *certain things*, in which *to be* and *to have been made* differ, however (in which) it is the same *to be made* and *to be*, as are successives, whose *to be* depends entirely on a producing principle existing in its actuality, as are movements and changes. There are *certain things*, in which it is the same *to be made* and *to be* and *to have been made*, as are those, which have a permanent *to be* and (which) totally depend on a producing principle, existing in its actuality through the same mode [modum], through which (it) in the beginning [in principio],[8] not only in itself, but also in respect of the product (existed), such that a consimilar mode of actuality is attained as much as regards both; and such are influences, either

gratia.

corporal or spiritual. Whence St. Augustine in the eighth (book) of *On a Litteral Exposition of Genesis*[9] says, that a light is always born and, while it is being born, it is, whence the air has been illuminated and always is being illuminated. Similarly he says[10] entirely (the same thing) of the spiritual light, which is grace.

Si igitur Filius Dei habet esse permanentissimum

If, therefore, the Son of God has a most permanent *to be*

[1] Fide plurium codd. ut B F H P Q Y et ed. 1 supplevimus *in*; quae lectio comprobatur etiam inde, quod infra in solutione huius obiectionis omnes codd. cum Vat. exhibeant praepositionem *in*. Plures codd. ut A G K S T V Y Z falso *generatio naturae* loco *generatione*; pauci ut F X cum ed. 1 *generatione naturae*.
[2] Vat. cum cod. cc adiungit *ibi*, quod bene deest in aliis mss et ed. 1.
[3] Libr. I. de Fide orthod. c. 8: Deus enim, ut qui tempori non subsit et principio, passione ac fluxione omni vacet sitque incorporeus ac solus ab interitu liber, ita citra tempus quoque et principium et passionem et fluxum et sine ullo congressu gignit, ac nec initium ned finem habet incomprehensibilis ipsius generatio.
[4] Cod. M addit *Filium*. Mox unus alterve cod. cum ed. 1 *generavit* loco *generat*.
[5] Lectio plurimum codd. ut H I P Q ee ff et ed. 1, in qua hic et paulo infra ponitur *simpliciter* pro *simplex et*, satis bona est.
[6] Vat., refragantibus mss. et ed. 1, legit *perditur, sed perficitur*.
[7] In Vat. ed cod. cc hic additur *et hoc proximo producente in facto esse*, quod tamen abest ab aliis mss et ed. 1 et superfluere videtur, quia hoc distinctionis membrum per duo alia satis superque explicatur. Paulo infra Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis tamen codd. cum ed. 1 renitentibus, post *propria* habet *sui* loco *sive*, sed non bene. Mox ex mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *substantiae* loco *substantia*.
[8] Intellige: in initio productionis. Sensus est: modus actualitatis principii taliter producentis idem est in principio seu initio et in continuatione productionis, tum in se tum quoad productum; sicut est v. g. actualitas solis illuminatntis et luminis vel aëris illuminati. Vat. falso et contra antiquiores codd. a ed 1 post *per quem* addit *sunt*.
[9] Cap. 12. n. 26: Neque enim, ut dicebamus, sicut operatur homo terram . . . ita Deus operatur hominem iustum, id est iustificando eum, ut si abscesserit, maneat in abscedente quod fecit; sed potius sicut aër praesente lumine non factus est lucidus, sed fit, quia si factus esset, non autem fieret, etiam absente lumine lucidus maneret; sic homo Deo sibi praesente illuminatur, absente autem continuo tenebratur.
[10] Vide textum modo citatum. — Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis vero cum ed. 1 reluctantibus, *dicendum* pro

[1] Trusting in many codices, such as B F H P Q Y, and edition 1 we have supplied *in* [in]; which reading is confirmed also from this, that below in the solution of this objection all the codices together with the Vatican text, exhibit the preposition *in* [in]. Very many codices, such as A G K S T V Y Z falsely have the nominative *a generation of a nature* [generatio naturae] in place of the ablative *a generation* [generatione]; a few, such as F X, together with edition 1 have the ablative *a generation of nature* [generatione naturae].
[2] The Vatican text together with codex cc adjoins *there* [ibi], which is well lacking in the other manuscripts and edition.
[3] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 8: For God, as one who is not subject [subsit] to time or beginning [principium], is free from [vacat] passion and from every flowing [fluxione] and is incorporeal and alone free [liber] from destruction, thus also begets beyond time and beginning [principium] and passion and flowing and without any congress, and His incomprehensible generation has neither start [initium] for end.
[4] Codex M adds *the Son* [Filium]. Then one or the other codex together with edition 1 has *has generated* [generavit] in place of *generates* [generat].
[5] The reading of very many codices, such as H I P Q ee ff, and edition 1, in which here an a little below this there is put *simply* [simpliciter] for *simple and*, is good enough.
[6] The Vatican text, disagreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1, reads in the indicative *lost, but is accomplished* [perditur, sed perficitur].
[7] In the Vatican text and codex cc there is here added *and this as one proximate producing the " to be " in the thing made* [et hoc proximo producente in facto esse], which however is absent in the other manuscripts and edition 1 and seems superfluous, because this member of the distinction is explained by means of the other two sufficiently and better. A little below this the Vatican text together with codex cc, however striving against the other codices and edition 1, after *their own principles* [principia propria] has *their own* [sui] in place of *either* [sive], but not well. Then from the manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *substances* [substantiae] in place of *substance* [substantia].
[8] Understand: at the beginning of the production. The

dicit.

sense is: the mode of actuality of the principle producing in such a manner is the same in the beginning or start and in the continuation of the production, both in itself as in regard to the product; just as, for the sake of example, is the actuality of the sun illuminating and of a light and/or the air illuminated. The Vatican text falsely and contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1 adds *they are* [sunt] after *through which* [per quem].

[9] Chapter 12, n. 26: For, as we were saying, and not just as a man works the earth . . . does God thus work the just man, that is by justifying him, so that if He separated Himself, there remains in the one separated, what He wrought; but more ably just as the air, with a light present, has not been made lucid, but is being made such, because if it had been made lucid, it would not be made such, (and) also would remain lucid with the light absenting itself; thus man is illuminated with God present to himself, but with Him absent is immediately put in the shadows [tenebratur].

[10] See the text just cited. — The Vatican text together with codex cc, but with the others and edition 1 resisting, has *it must be said* [dicendum] for *he says* [dicit].

---

et esse coniunctissimum principio productivo, ut in sui actualitate existenti, quia ipse Filius est purus[1] actus; omnino idem est in ipso *nasci* et *natum esse*; et ideo semper nascitur et semper est natus et semper est, nec unquam desinit nec cessat generari, nec Pater generare.

and a "to be" most conjoined with His productive Principle, as in one existing in its actuality, because the Son Himself is the Pure[1] Act; it is entirely the same in Him *to be born* and *to have been born*; and for that reason He is always being born and always has been born and always is, nor does He ever desist nor cease to be generated, nor does the Father (cease) to generate (Him).

Cum ergo quaeritur, an generatio Filii sit *terminata*, distinguendum est , quia *terminatum* aut excludit *imperfectionem*; et sic generatio Filii est terminata, quia perfecta, cum simul sint,[2] immo idem sit *generari* et *generatum esse*. Si vero excludat *durationem*, falsa est, quia semper durat.

When, therefore, it is it asked, whether the generation of the Son be *terminated*, it must be distinguished, that *terminated* either excludes *imperfection*; and in this manner the generation of the Son has been terminated, because (it is) perfect, since they are simultaneous,[2] nay (for Him) it is the same *to be generated* and *to have been generated*. But if it excludes *duration*, it is false, because it always endures [durat].

Concedo ergo, quod generatio Filii est interminata ratione desitionis, quia nunquam desinit generari, sicut probant rationes ad secundam partem adductae.

I concede, therefore, that the generation of the Son has not been terminated [est interminata] by reason of desisting [desitionis], because He never desists from being generated, just as the reasons adduced for the second part prove.

1. Ad illud[3] quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod qui semper nascitur nunquam est natus; dicendum, quod verum est in illa generatione, in qua differt *nasci* et *natum esse*; sed non talis est generatio divina. Attamen quia generatio divina intelligitur per generationem creatam, et in creaturis de perfecte nato non dicitur nasci, sed natum esse: ideo vult Augustinus,[4] quod melius dicitur Filius *natus esse*, quia intelligibilius est, non quia ei non conveniat *nasci*.

1. To that[3] which is objected in the Contrary, that who is always being born never has been born; it must be said, that it is true in that generation, in which *to be born* and *to have been born* differ; but the divine generation is not such. But yet, because divine generation is understood through created generation, and in creatures *to be born* is not said of a perfect born, but "to have been born" (is): for that reason (St.) Augustine wants,[4] that the Son is said better *to have been born*, because it is more intelligible, not because it is not fitting [conveiat] for Him *to be born*.

2. 3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod produci terminatur ad productum esse, et *similiter*, nobilius est generatum esse quam generari; dicendum, quod omnia ista tantum ibi habent locum, ubi differt generari et generatum esse. In illa[5] autem generatione locum non habent.

2. 3. To that which is objected, that "to be produced" is terminated at "to have been produced", and *similarly*, (that) it is more noble to have been generated than to be generated; it must be said, that all these (reasons) only have a place there, where to be generated and to have been generated differ. But in that[5] generation they do not have a place.

4. Ad illud quod ultimo obiicitur, in generatione, quae semper est in generando etc.; solvendum est per interemptionem; non enim est verum, quod generatio semper ens[6] semper de novo aliquid producat, quia radius semper oritor a sole, nec tamen semper iteratur nec succedit, sed a sua origine continuatur in esse.

4. To that which is last objected, in a generation, which is always in the one to be generated etc.; it must be solved through interemption; for it is not true, that a generation always-being [semper ens][6] always produces something anew [de novo], because a ray is always arising from the Sun, and yet it is not always being iterated [iteratur] nor does it succeed, but it continued in (its) “being” [in esse] by its own origin.

SCHOLION.

I. In quaestione praecedenti probatum est, quod generatio Filii non habet *initium*; hic quaeritur, utrum habet *terminum*, sive utrum sit terminata. Et cum vocabulum *terminata* habeat duplicem sensum, quatenus excludit aut imperfectionem aut durationem, quaestio haec etiam duplici conclusione resolvitur. — Triplex distinctio in principio responsionis satis notabilis est.

II. De ipsa quaestione cfr. hic dub. 8. —

SCHOLIUM

I. In the preceding question it was proved, that the generation of the Son does not have a *beginning* [initium]; here it is asked, whether it has a *terminus*, or whether it has been terminated. And since the word *terminated* has a twofold sense, insofar as it excludes either imperfection or duration, this question is resolved also with a twofold conclusion. — The threefold distinction in the beginning of the response is notable enough.

II. On this question cf. here dubium 8. —

Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 42. m. 5. a. 2. — Scot., hic q. unic. ad 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 2. a. 2; S. I. q. 42. a. 2. ad 4. — B. Albert., hic a. 19; S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 30. m. 4. particula 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 1. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 2; a. 3. q. 1. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 3. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 54. q. 3. n. 70. — Durand., hic q. 4.

Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 42, m. 5, a. 2. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here at q. sole, n. 3. — St. Thomas, here at q. 2, a. 2; Summa., I, q. 42, a. 2, n. 4. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), here at a. 19; Summa., p. I, tr. 7, q. 30, m. 4, part. 1. — (Bl.) Peterr of Tarentaise, here at q. 4, a. 1 and 2. — Richard of Middletown, here at a. 2, q. 2; a. 3, q. 1 and 2. — Giles the Roman, here at 2nd princ., q. 3. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 54, q. 3, n. 70. — Durandus, here at q. 4.

---

[1] Ita vetustiores mss. et ed. 1, dum Vat. cum cod. cc *ipse est Filius et purus*. Paulo ante unus alterve cod. ut P Q cum ed. 1 *sua* loco *sui*.
[2] Lectio Vat. *simile* loco *simul sint* corrigitur ex mss. et ed. 1.
[3] Ed. 1 addit *ergo*.
[4] Verba Augustini vide supra in ipsa obiectione. — Mox ed. 1 *dicatur* loco *dicitur*. Paulo ante fide mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *perfecte* pro *perfecto*.
[5] Vat. contra mss. *ista*.
[6] Hoc est, quae semper est. — Paulo infra post *nec tamen semper* Vat. explicando addit *eius productio*, quod deest in mss. et ed. 1.

[1] Thus the older manuscripts and edition 1, while the Vatican text together with codex cc has *He Himself is the Son and the Pure* [ipse est Filius et purus]. A little before this one or the other codices, such as P and Q, together with edition 1 has *its own* [sua] in place of *its* [sui].
[2] The reading of the Vatican text, *similar* [simile] in place of *are simultaneous* is corrected from the manuscripts and edition 1.
[3] Edition 1 adds *therefore*.
[4] See words of (St.) Augustine above in the objection itself. — Then edition 1 has *be said* [dicatur] in place of *is said* [dicitur].
[5] The Vatican text, contrary to the manuscripts, has *that . . . of His* [ista].
[6] That is, what is always. A little below this after *and yet it is not always* [nec tamen semper] the Vatican text by explaining adds *its generation* [eius generatio], which is lacking in the manuscripts and edition 1.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quarrachi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM VIII.

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 187-192.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Dub. I.

In parte ista incidunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo dubitatur de hoc quod dicitur: *Non est aliud Pater, aliud Filius, aliud Spiritus sanctus, quamvis personaliter* etc. Videtur enim falsum quod dicitur, quia bene sequitur: Petrus est ablus homo, ergo est animal album, quia idem significat albus et album: ergo pari ratione, quia idem significat[7] *alius* et *aliud*, sequitur: est *alius*, ergo est *aliud ens*. *Si tu dicas*, quod non est simile de hoc nomine *alius* et de hoc nomine *ens*;[8] *contra*: bene sequitur: est alius homo, ergo est aliud animal: ergo a simili illud sequitur.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod quia in Deo est singularis alietas, quia *alietas est suppositi* cum omnimoda *unitate naturae*: ideo singulari modo oportet exprimi. Et quoniam masculinum genus importat quandam distinctionem vel discretionem,[9] ideo respicit personam; sed neutrum propter indistinctionem respicit naturam: et ideo *alius* importat alietatem in persona, *aliud*[10] in natura, et ideo in divinis non idem significant.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION IX

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 187-192.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Doubt I

In this part there occurs doubts concerning the text (of Master Peter), and first there is a doubt concerning this which he says: *One thing is not the Father, another thing the Son, another thing the Holy Spirit, although personally* etc.. For it seems that what is said (is) false, because there rightly [bene] follows: 'Peter is a white man, therefore he is a white animal', because "white" [albus] and "white" [album] signifies the same (thing): therefore for a equal reason, because *another one* [alius] and *another thing* [aliud] signifies[7] the same (thing), there follows: it is *another one* [alius], therefore it is *another being* [aliud ens]. *If you say*, that it is not similar concerning this noun *another one* [alius] and concerning this noun *a being* [ens];[8] *on the contrary*: there rightly follows: he is another man, therefore he is another animal: therefore by similar (reasoning) it does follow.

I respond: It must be said, that because in God there is a singular otherness [singularis alietas], because *otherness belongs to a supposit* with an omnimodal *unity of nature*: for that reason it is proper that it be expressed in a singular manner. And since the masculine genus conveys [importat] a certain distinction and/or separation [discretionem],[9] for that reason it respects a person; but the neuter on account of (its) indistinction respects the nature: and for that reason *another one* [alius] conveys *otherness* in person, *another thing* [aliud][10] in nature, and for that reason among the

divine they do not signify the same (thing).

Posset etiam dici, quod in creaturis aliud significat,[11] cum dico: iste est *alius* ab illo, et aliud, cum dico: *est aliud*; et unum sequitur ad aliud. Non sic in divinis; et non est simile de albo, quia album imponitur a forma speciali, quae est albedo.

It could also be said, that in creatures it signifies one thing,[11] when I say: this is *other* [alius] than that, and another, when I say: *it is another thing* [aliud]; and one follows after the other. Not so among the divine: and it is not similar concerning (something) white, because white is imposed by a special form, which is whiteness.

[7] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 hic et paulo ante *significant*.
[8] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et sex primarum edd. *aliud ens*.
[9] Codd. antiquiores inter se non consentiunt; alii enim ut T W cum ed. 1 omittunt *distinctionem vel*, alii autem ut A F G H I K S V X Y Z etc. *vel discretionem*.
[10] Vat. repetit hic *alietatem*, quod deest in mss. et ed. 1.
[11] Ed. 1 *significatur* et paulo post *consequitur* loco *sequitur*. — Plura de hac re vide supra d. 4. q. 2.

[7] The Vatican text, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, here and a little after this has *signify* [significant].
[8] The Vatican text, not trusting in the testimony of the manuscripts and the six first editions, has *another being* [aliud ens].
[9] The more ancient codices do not agree among themselves; for some, such as T and W, together with edition 1 omit *distinction and/or* [distinctionem vel], but others, such as A F G H I K S V X Y Z etc. *and/or discretion* [vel discretionem].
[10] The Vatican text repeats here *otherness* [alietatem], which is lacking in the manuscripts and edition 1.
[11] Edition 1 has *is signified* [significatur] and a little after this *follows completely* [consequitur] in place of *follows* [sequitur]. — For more on this subject see above d. 4, q. 2.

p. 188

Dub. II.

Doubt II

Item dubitatur secundo de hoc quod dicit: *Coaternae sibi sunt tres personae*. Videtur falsum, quia si coaeternae, et[1] aeternae: ergo tres aeterni, quod est contra *Symbolum*, ubi dicitur: « Non tres aeterni »; et iterum contra *rationem*, quia numerus pluralis multiplicat formam. Unde non vere dicitur: tres sunt dii.

Likewise there is a doubt, second, concerning this which he says: *Coeternal to Themselves are the Three Persons*. It seems false, because if coeternal, also[1] eternal: therefore three Eternals, which is contrary to the (Athanasian) *Creed*, where it says: *Not three eternals*; and again, (it is) contrary to *reason*, because a plural number multiplies form. Whence it is not truly said: The Three are gods.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod nomen significans *substaniam* in divinis reperitur secundum triplicem modum. *Quoddam* enim significat[2] substantiam et per modum substantiae, ut nomen substantivum, ut Deus; et tale nullo modo plurificatur nec dicitur pluraliter, sive sit substantivum, sive

I respond: It must be said, that a noun [nomen] signifying *substance* is found among the divine in a threefold manner. For *a certain* (noun) signifies[2] substance and through the manner of a substance, as a substantive noun [nomen substantivum], such as God; and such is in no manner

substantivatum, ut[3] hoc nomen *aeternus*; sic accipitur in Symbolo. *Quaedem* significant substantiam per modum adiacentiae, sicut nomina adiectiva adiective retenta;[4] et talis, quia trahunt numerum a substantivis, dicuntur pluraliter, et de genere talium sunt verba et participia. *Alia* sunt nomina, quae important substantiam in adiacentia, connotando intra relationem mutuam, qualia sunt *coaeterni*;[5] et talia ex duplici causa possunt dici pluraliter, tum ratione *consignificationis* sive modi significandi, tum ratione *connotationis*. Et sic patet, quod nulla est contradictio.

plurified nor is said in a plural manner, whether it is substantive, or has been made a substantive [substantivatum], such as[3] this noun '*the Eternal One'* [aeternus]; thus it is accepted in the Creed. *Certain* (nouns) signify substance through a manner of adjacency, just as adjectival nouns retained in the manner of an adjective [adiective retenta];[4] and such, because they draw number from substantives, are said in a plural manner, and from the genus of such are verbs and participles. There are *other* names, which convey [important] substance in adjacents, by connoting within a mutual relation, such are *coeternals*;[5] and such can be said in a plural manner from a twofold cause, both by a reckoning of *consignification* or of a manner of signifying, as by a reckoning of *connotation*. And in this manner it is clear, that there is no contradiction.

Quod[6] autem obiicitur, quod pluralis numerus plurificat formam; dicendum, quod hoc non est verum in adiectivis.[7]

Moreover, what[6] is objected, that a plural number plurifies form; it must be said, that this is not true in adjectives.[7]

Dub. III.

Doubt III

Qui hoc dicit, non intelligit, natum esse etc. Hic ponit Magister quatuor rationes demonstrantes, Filium coaeternum Patri, et ita argumentum Arii non valere:[8] Filius est natus, ergo non est aeternus.

Who says this, does not understand, that to have been born etc.. Here Master (Peter) posits four reasons demonstrating, that the Son is coeternal to the Father, and that thus (this) argument of Arius is not valid [non valere]:[8] 'The Son has been born, therefore He is not eternal'.

Prima sumta est a *simili* et est talis: splendor est eiusdem durationis cum igne sive aequalis, et tamen est generatus ab igne: ergo multo fortius, cum Filius sit splendor Patris,[9] quamvis ab ipso generetur, erit ei coaeternus: ergo conclusio praedictae rationis est falsa, et illa consequentia est interimenda: si natus est, erat quando non erat. *Sed contra*: Si emanatio procedens a Deo est ei coaeterna, sicut emanatio procedens a creatura est ei coaequaeva:[10] ergo cum res exierint a Deo, videtur quod ab aeterno.

The first has been taken from the *similar* and is such: 'the splendor is of the same duration with the fire or equal (to it), and yet it has been generated by the fire: therefore much more strongly, since the Son is the Splendor of the Father,[9] though He is generated by Him, He will be coeternal to Him': therefore the conclusion of the aforesaid reckoning is false, and its [illa] consequence is to be overturned [est interimenda]: 'if He has been born, there was a when He was not'. *But on the contrary*: If an emanation proceeding from [a] God is coeternal to Him, just as an emanation proceeding from [a] a creature is equally-coeval [coaequaeva]:[10] therefore

since things have come forth from [a] God, it seems that (they have done so) from eternity.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod egressus spelndoris[11] a luce vel igne est egressus connaturalis; et talis est egressus Filii a Patre, non autem egressus creaturae a Creatore, immo est voluntarius; et argumentum est bonum in proposito.

I **respond**: It must be said, that the egress of splendor[11] from light and/or fire is a connatural egress; and such is the egress of the Son from [a] the Father, but not the egress of a creature from [a] the Creator, nay (this latter) is voluntary; and the argument is good in the Propositum.

Item, si Dei Filius, inquit Augustinus, virtus et sapientia. Haec est secunda ratio Augustini: Filius Dei est virtus et sapientia: ergo si non est aeternus, aliquando fuit Deus sine virtute et sapientiae; sed hoc est impossibile: ergo etc. *Sed contra* hanc rationem sic obiicitur: si enim sequitur: si Pater non habet sapientiam genitam, non est sapiens, videtur quod sit sapiens sapientia genita, quod expresse negat Augustinus in sexto de Trinitate.[12]

Likewise, "If the Son of God," says (St.) Augustine, "(is) the virtue and wisdom". This is (St.) Augustine's second reason: the Son is God's virtue and wisdom: therefore if He is not eternal, God was at some time without virtue and wisdom; and this is impossible: ergo etc.. *But contrary* to this reason it is objected thus: for if it followed: if the Father does not have a begotten wisdom, He is not wise, it seems that He is wise by a begotten wisdom, which (St.) Augustine expressly denies in the sixth (book) On the Trinity.[12]

Respondeo: Augustinus istam rationem redarguit in sexto de Trinitate,[13] ostendens, illam procedere ex malo intellectu verbi; attamen, quia Magister adducit eam, potest dici, quod ratio valet, non quia Pater sit sapiens Filio, qui est sapientia genita, sed quia eadem[14] est sapientia genita et ingenita; et ita, si una incipit, et alia.

I **respond**: (St.) Augustine disproves [redarguit] that reason in the sixth (book) On the Trinity,[13] showing, that that (reason) proceeds from a bad understanding of the word; and yet, because Master (Peter) adduces it, it can be said, that that reason is valid, not because the Father is wise by the Son [Filio], who is begotten wisdom, but because the Same[14] is the Begotten Wisdom and the Unbegotten; and thus, if one begins [incipit], also the other.

Eidem quoque Arianicae quaestioni. Haec est tertia ratio quam adducit, et est Ambrosii, sumta ab auctoritate Isaiae: *Ante me non est Deus, et post me non erit*: ergo nec Pater ante Filium, nec Filius post Patrem. *Sed contra*: In divinis personis est ordo; sed ordo non est nisi prioris ad posterius: ergo etc.

Also to the same question of Arius. This is the third reason which he adduces, and it belongs to (St.) Ambrose, taken from the authority of Isaiah: *Before me there is not a God, and after Me there shall not be (one)*: therefore neither (is) the Father before the Son, nor the Son before the Father. *But on the contrary*: Among the Divine Persons there is an order; but an order is not but of prior to posterior: ergo etc.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, sicut infra patebit,[15] non est ibi ordo durationis, quo alter est prior altero, sed ordo originis, quo

I **respond**: It must be said, that, must as shall be clear below,[15] there is There no order of duration, by which one is prior to

alter ex altero.

the other [alter est prior altero], but an order of origin, by which one is out of the other [alter ex altero].

Invicem enim in se, Pater in Filio, et Filius | in Patre cognoscitur.

For mutually among Themselves, the Father in the Son and the Son | in the Father is cognized.

---

1 Unus alterque cod. ut P Q *ergo* loco *et*.
2 Ita plurimi antiquiores codd., dum Vat. cum ed. 1 et cod. cc legit *Quaedam enim significant*.
3 Vat. cum cod. cc, interpunctione mutata, loco *ut* ponit *et*. — Sub voce *substantivatum* intellige adiectivum vel aliud nomen loco substantivi adhibitum.
4 Pro non congruo vocabulo *tenta* ope mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *retenta*; mox antiquioribus mss. cum ed. 1 consentientibus, lectionem perturbatam Vat. et cod. cc correximus ponendo *quia* pro *quae*.
5 Nonnulli codd. ut H M Y ee cum ed. 1 addunt *et huiusmodi*. Paulo post fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 pro *significationis* substituimus *consignificationis*, quod primam rationem, scilicet quatenus sunt adiectiva seu ipmortant substantiam in adiacentia, distinctius exhibet; secunda ratio fundatur in connotata mutua relatione.
6 Ed. 1 *Ad illud quod obiicitur*. Mox cod dd *multiplicat* loco *plurificat*.
7 De hac solutione vide infra d. 24. a. 1. q. 2. Cfr. etiam Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 49. m. 3. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 2, et S. I. q. 39. a. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 7. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 3. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic circa litteram.
8 Vat. hic addit *quod tale est*, quae tamen verba desunt in codd. et ed. 1. Nonnulli codd. ut E F I K W Y Z *valet* pro *valere*. Mox post *ergo non* supplevimus ex mss et ed. 1 *est*.
9 Fide mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic superflue additum *et*, e contra paulo infra post *consequntia* adiecimus *est*.
10 Codd. inter se dissentiunt, alii enim ut E F I N U X Z habent *coaeva* loco *coaequaeva*, alii ut A G K S T W dd ff falso addunt *coaeterna*, sicut et ed. 1 falso habet *coaeva et coaeterna*.
11 Vat. praeter fiem mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 hic addit *a sole*, et paulo infra post *talis est* contra vetustiores codd. et ed. 1 habet *egressio* loco *egressus*. [Tr. Note: the Propositum is the first section of the Question, which is the followed by the Contrarium and the Response].
12 Cap. 1. n. 1. Vide etiam ibid. VIII. c. 1. n. 2. et XV. c. 7. n. 12.
13 Cap. 1. n. 2.
14 Ed. 1 addit *sapientia*. — Plura hac de re vide infra d. 32. a. 2. q. 1.
15 Dist. 20. a. 2. q. 1. et. 2. — Paulo infra multi codd. ut A F G H I K T V W X etc. *prius* loco *prior*.

---

1 On or the other codex, such as P and Q, have *therefore* [ergo] in place of *also* [et].
2 Thus very many of the more ancient codices, while the Vatican text together with edition 1 and codex cc reads *For certain (names) signify* [Quaedam enim significant].
3 The Vatican text together with codex cc, with changed punctuation, put *and* [et] in place of *such as* [ut]. — By the word *has been made a substantive* [substantivatum] understand an adjective and/or another noun employed in place of a substantive.
4 In place of the non-congruous term *held* [tenta], we have substituted, with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1, *retained* [retenta]; then with the more ancient manuscripts consenting with edition 1, we have corrected the distorted reading of the Vatican text and of codex cc by putting *because* [quia] in place of *which* [quae].
5 Not a few codices, such as H M Y ee, with edition 1, add *and of this kind* [et huiusmodi]. A little after this, trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have substituted *of consignification* [consignificationis] for *of signification* [significationis], because it exhibits the first reckoning more clearly, that is to the extent that they are adjectives or convey (the notion of) substance in adjacents; the second reckoning is founded in a connotated, mutual relation.
6 Edition 1 reads *To that which is objected* [Ad illud quod obiicitur]. Then codex dd has *multiplies* [multiplicat] in place of *plurifies* [plurificat].
7 Concerning this solution see below d. 24, a. 1, q. 2. Cf. also Alexander of Hales, <u>Summa</u>., p. I, q. 49, m. 3. — St. Thomas , here at q. 1, a. 2 [sic], and <u>Summa</u>., I, q. 39, a. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), here at a. 7. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here at q. 3, a. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here about the text.
8 The Vatican text here adds *which is such* [quod tale est], which words, however, ar lacking in the codices and in edition 1. Not a few codices, such as E F I K W Y Z, have *and thus . . . is not valid* [et ita . . . non valet] for *and that thus . . . is not valid* [et ita . . . non valere]. then at *therefore . . . not* [ergo non] we have supplied from the manuscripts and edition 1 *He is* [est].
9 Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1 we have expunged here the superfluously added *and* [et], and on the contrary a little below this after *consequence* [consequentia] was have inserted *is* [est].
10 The codices dissent among themselves, for some, such as E F I N U X Z have *coeval* [coaeva] in place of *equally coeval* [coaequaeva], others, such as A G K S T W dd ff, falsely add *coeternal* [coaeterna], justa s edition 1 also falsely has *coeval and coeternal*.

[11] The Vatican text, not trusting in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, here adds *from the sun* [a sole], and a little below this after *such is* [talis est], contrary to the older codices and edition 1, it has *egression* [egressio] for *egress* [egressus].
[12] Chapter 1, n. 1. See also ibid., Bk. VII, ch. 1, n. 2, and Bk. XV, ch. 7, n. 12.
[13] Chapter 1, n. 2.
[14] Edition 1 adds *wisdom* [sapientia].
[15] Distinction 20, a. 2, q. 1 and 2. — A little below this many codices, such as A F G H I K T V W X etc., have the neuter *prior* [prius] in place of the masculine *prior* [prior].

---

in Patre cognoscitur. Haec est quarta ratio et est talis: relativa simul sunt natura;[1] sed Pater et Filius sunt relativa: ergo simul; sed Pater est aeternul: ergo Filius coaeternus. *Probatio*, quod Pater est aeternus: quia, si prius fuit Deus et postea Pater, mutatus est.[2] *Sed contra* istam rationem potest argui pari ratione: prius fuit *Deus* et postea *Dominus*: ergo mutatus est.

in the Father is cognized. This is the fourth reason and it is such: relatives are simultaneous by nature;[1] but Father and Son are relatives: therefore simultaneous; but the Father is eternal: therefore the Son coeternal. The *proof*, that the Father is eternal: because, if first He was God and afterwards the Father, He has been changed.[2] *But contrary* to this reason of his there can be argued by an equal reason: He was first *God* and afterwards *Lord*: therefore He has been changed.

R**ESPONDEO**: *Aliqui* volunt dicere, quod ista ratio valet, quia generatio est de substantia generantis; et ideo si incipit generare, substantia mutatur. Sed hoc non videtur, quia generatio in divinis non dicit motum. *Alii* dicut, quod quia genitus est consubstantialis gignenti, si mutatur genitus, et gignens; sed genitus mutatur, si de novo generatur: ergo et generans per consequens. *Alius* modus dicendi est, quod paternitas veram dicit habitudinem in Patre, non sic creatio vel dominatio; et ideo paternitas adveniens[3] mutat, non sic dominatio.

I **RESPOND**: *Some* want to say, that that reason of his is valid, because generation is from [est de] the substance of the one generating; and for that reason if He begins to generate, (His) Substance is changed. But this does not seem (so), because generation among the divine does not mean movement [motum]. *Others* say, that because the One begotten is consubstantial to the One begetting, if the One begotten is changed, also the One begetting; but the One begotten is changed, if He is generated anew [de novo]: therefore also the One generating as a consequence [per consequens]. There is *another* manner of saying, that paternity means a true habitude in the Father, non so creation and/or domination; and for that reason an adventive paternity [paternitas adveniens][3] does change, not so domination.

Sed nulla praedictarum rationum[4] dat vigorem huic rationi contra haereticos, quia hereticus dicebat, quod Filius non erat

But none of the aforesaid reasons[4] gives vigor to this reckoning against the heretics, because the heretic (Arius) said, that the

coaeternus, ac per hoc nec consubstantialis, nec idem in substantia. Propter hoc notandum, quod praedicta ratio bona est contra haereticum, facta eius suppositione; quia haereticus dicebat Patrem et Filium differentes in substantia et natura, sicut in generatione carnali. Pari ratione contra eium dicit Ambrosius: cum ita sit, quod Pater iste[5] mutetur accessione generationis, qui generat alium in substantia; et in divnis similiter Pater generat alium in substantia: ergo accessione generationis mutatur, ut[6] iste.

Son was not coeternal, and through this neither consubstantial, nor the same in substance. On this account it must be noted, that the aforesaid reason is good against the heretic, made on supposition of this: that the heretic said that the Father and the Son differed in substance and nature, just as in carnal generation. For an equal reason (St.) Ambrose says against him: since it is thus, that that Father of yours[5] is changed by the accession of generation, who generates an other in substance; similarly among the divine the Father also generates an other in substance: therefore by the accession of generation He is changed, as[6] that One of yours.

Quocumque tamen modo dicatur, non est magnum periculum, quia non omnia argumenta, quae fiunt ad veritatem, sunt necessaria.[7]

However, in whatever manner it be said, there is no [non] great danger, because not all arguments, which are made for the truth, are necessary.[7]

Dub. IV.

Doubt IV

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Vox silet non mea tantum, sed et Angelorum*. Videtur enim male dicere *Angelorum*, quia vox non est nisi habentium organa et respirationem; sed Angeli haec non habent. *Si dicas*, quod habent voces spirituales, non prolatas, sicut dicit Damascenus,[8] quod tradant sibi intelligentias suas sine voce prolatas; quaero, quae sit necessitas vocis spiritualis, et quis modus loquendi, et quis modus audiendi?

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *The voice is silent: not mine only, but also that of the Angels*. For it seems that he says *that of the Angels* badly, because the voice is not but of those having organs and respiration; but the Angels do not have these. *If you say*, that they have spiritual voices, unspoken [non prolatas], just as (St. John) Damascene says,[8] that they betray to themselves their own understandings spoken [prolatas] without a voice; I ask, what is the necessity of a spiritual voice, and what manner of speaking (is this), and what manner of hearing?

Respondeo: Breviter hic dicendum est — quia hoc extra principale propositum est quantum ad partem istam — quod necessitas est locutionis;[9] quia sicut unicuique naturae rationali data est voluntas libera, sic conscientia secreta. Unde sicut non potest aliquis voluntatem alterius in aliud vetere, sed solum inducere, nisi ipsa se inclinet, praeter solum Deum, in cuius manu sunt corda hominum: ita nemo potest[10] conceptiones alterius cognoscere, sed solum coniicere, praeter Deum, nisi ipsa

I respond: It must be said here briefly — because as much as it regards this part, this is outside the principle Propositum — that there is a necessity of speaking [locutionis];[9] because just as to each rational nature there has been given a free will, so (also) a secret conscience. Whence just as no one [non aliquis] can turn the will of another to something else, but only to induce it, to inclines itself, besides God alone, in whose Hand are the hearts of men: so no one [nemo] can cognize[10] the

intelligentia exprimat; et ipsa expressio locutio nuncupatur. *Ratio* autem huius est, quia solus Deus format mentem et quantum ad intellectum et quantum ad affectum; et modus loquendi similis est modo addiscendi. Sicut enim nos per sensum addiscimus, ita quod species per interiorem sensum pervenit ad intellectum, sic exprimimus; quia verbum cogitationis internae unitur voci[11] in excogitatione et postmodum voci sensibili in pronuntiatione, et ex hoc fit expressio in actu. Angelus autem unica virtute facit quod nos pluribus. Unde Angelus, sicut per applicationem speciei innatae ad ipsum cognoscibile ipsum cognoscit, sic ordinando speciem innatam ad alium Angelum cognoscentem, conceptus suos aperit; similiter alius mutua conversione recipit; et sic unus loquitur, alter audit. Simile est de duobus speculis sibi oppositis, si voluntarie possent abscondere aliis et offerre[12] quae in se relucent.

conceptions of another, but only conjecture (what they are), besides God, unless the intelligence itself expresses them; and that expression is termed speaking [locutio]. Moreover the *reason* for this is, that God alone forms the mind both as much as regards the intellect and as much as regards the affection [affectum]; and the manner of speaking [modum loquendi] is similar to the manner of learning something new [modo addiscendi]. For just as we learn something new through sense, so that the species arrives through the interior sense at the intellect, in the same manner we express; because the word of internal thought [cogitationis internae] is united to the voice[11] in excogitation and after the manner of the sensible voice in pronunciation, and out of this expression it comes to be in act [fit in actu]. But an Angel by a unique virtue does what we do by many. Whence an Angel, just as it cognizes itself as through the application of an innate species to the cognoscible itself, so by ordaining the innate species to another, cognizant Angel, it opens its own concept; similarly the other receives a mutual conversion; and in this manner one speaks [loquitur], the other hears. It is similar concerning two mirrors (placed) opposite to one another, if they could voluntarily conceal and offer[12] to others, the things which they reflect in themselves.

Dub. V.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Dicamus ergo verius, semper natus*; et ratio sua est, ut Deus aternus et perfectus valeat designari. *Sed contra* hoc est, quod inter omnia tempora praesens maiorem convenientiam habet cum aeternitate; quia verius dicitur *est* de Deo, quam *fuit* et *erit*, sicut exponit Augustinus, sicut habitum est in praecedenti distinctione.[13] Et ratio huius est, quia praesens dicit ens in actu, alia tempora non.

Doubt V

Likewise is asked concerning this, which he says: *Therefore let us say more truly, always born*; and this is his reckoning, so that the eternal and perfect God be validly designated [valeat designari]. *But against* this is, that among all the tenses [tempora] the present has a greater fittingness [convenientiam] with eternity; because more truly is '*is*' said of God, that '*was*' and '*will be*', just as (St.) Augustine expounds it, as is had [habitum est] in the preceding disctinction.[13] And the reason for this is, that the present means a being in act [ens in actu], the other tenses not (so).

---

[1] Airstot, de Praedicam. c. de Relativis. — Mox post *simul* fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *sed*

[1] Aristotle, On the Predicaments, ch. "On Relatives". — Then after *therefore simultaneous* [ergo simul],

loco *si* et *Probatio* pro *Probatur*.
[2] Est ratio Ambrosii, quae habetur in lit. Magistri. c. 2. in fine.
[3] Fide plurium mss. ut H I K M etc. et ed. 1 substituimus *adveniens* pro *veniens*.
[4] Cod. D *responsionum*. Mox cod. Y *haereticum* pro *haereticos*. Paulo infra in Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 post *coaeternus* additur *Patri* et pro *nec* habetur *non*, ac post *idem* omittitur *in*.
[5] Auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 delevimus hic superflue repetitum *carnalis*.
[6] Vat., obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1, 2, 3, *et* loco *et*.
[7] Hoc dubium fusius explicatur hic q. 3.
[8] Libr. II. de Fide orthod. c. 3: Sed sine ulla prolati sermonis ope mutuo sibi sensa sua communicant et consilia.
[9] Sequimur codd. Y Z, cum multi cum ed. 1 ponunt, sed non ita bene *quia necessitas locutionis*, Vat. autem cum praecedentis coniugendo legit: *quae sit in Angelis necessitas locutionis*.
[10] Cod. V addit *cogitationes seu*.
[11] In cod. T a secunda manu additum est *intelligibili*.
[12] Fide plurimum mss. ut F H P Q cc dd ee substituimus bonam lectionem *offerre* pro *auferre*, loco cuius cod. Y ponit *ostendere* et ed. 1 *afferre*. — Plura de locutione Angelorum vide II. Sent. d. 10. a. 3. q. 1.
[13] Parte I. lit. Magistri c. 1. et dub. 7. — Mox ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus particulam *Et*, quam etiam paulo superius post *fuit* substituimus loco *aut*.

trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *but* [sed] in place of *if* [si] and *The proof* [Probatio] for *It is proved* [Probatur].
[2] This is the reckoning of (St.) Ambrose, which is had in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2 at the end.
[3] Trusting in many manuscripts, such as H I K M etc., and edition 1 we have substituted *an adventive* [adveniens] for *a coming* [veniens]. [Tr. Note: an *adventive* paternity is one which accedes to it, and is thus not coevel with the nature.].
[4] Codex D has *responses* [responsionum]. Then codex Y has *against the heretic* [contra haereticum] for *against the heretics* [contra haereticos]. A little below this in the Vatican text, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, after *coeternal* [coaeternus] there is added *to the Father* [Patri], and for *neither* [nec] there is had *not* [non], and after *the same* [idem] there is omitted *in* [in].
[5] On the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have deleted here the superfluous *carnal* [carnalis].
[6] The Vatican text, disagreeing with the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3, has *also* [et] pro *as* [ut].
[7] This doubt is more fully explained here in q. 3.
[8] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. II, ch. 3: But without any spoken speech [prolati sermonis] with mutual help they communicate to themselves their own thoughts [sensa] and counsels.
[9] We follow codices Y and Z, while many together with edition 1 have, but not so well, *that the necessity of speech* [quia necessitas locutionis], but the Vatican text joining itself with the preceding words reads: *to which the necessity of speaking in the Angels belongs* [quae sit in Angelis necessitas locutionos].
[10] Codex V adds *the thoughts or* [cogitationes seu].
[11] In codex T there is added by a second hand *intelligible* [intelligibili].
[12] Trusting in many manuscripts, such as F H P Q cc dd and ee, we have substituted a good reading *offer* [offerre] for *bear off* [aufferre], in place of which codex Y has *shown* [ostendere] and edition 1 *bring toward* [afferre]. — For more on the speaking of the Angels see Sent., Bk. II, d. 10, a. 3, q. 1.
[13] Part I of the text of Master (Peter), ch. 1 and dubium 7. — Then from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted the particle *And* [Et], which a little above this after *was* [fuit] we have also substituted in place of *or* [aut].

p. 190

R**ESPONDEO**: Dicendum, sicut supra tactum est,[1] quod verba diversorum temporum dicta de Deo non significant aliquos temporales actus, sed important durationem divini esse sine initio, ut praeteritum; sine invervallo, ut praesens; sine termino, ut futurum. Et quia omnia ista

I **RESPOND**: It must be said, that just as be touched upon above,[1] that verbs of diverse tenses, said of God, do not signify other temporal acts, but convey the duration of the Divine "To Be" [divini esse] without a beginning, such as (is) the past; without an interval, such as (is) the present; without a

aeque vere reperiuntur in Deo, ideo omnia aeque vere dicuntur de eo.[2]

terminus, such as (is) the future. And because all these are found in God in a equally true manner; for that reason are all said of Him[2] in an equally true manner.

Sed tamen, quia multi erraverunt in generatione quantum ad initium, pauci vel nulli quantum ad intervallum vel terminum: ideo sacri Doctores, ut ora haereticorum obstruerent, eam[3] per verbum praeteriti temporis, quod semper significat ut praeteritum, et ita nunquam habere principium, expresserunt.

But, however, because many erred in regard to [in] the Generation as much as regards its beginning [ad initium], few and/or none as much as regards its interval and/or terminus: for that reason the sacred Doctors, to block up the mouths of heretics, expressed it[3] through a verb of the past tense, because it always signifies that (something is) past, and thus never had a beginning [principium].

Alia ratio est, quia nos generationem divinam manuductione quadam intelligimus per generationem, quae circa nos est; et quia videmus in hac generatione, quia genitus, dum generatur, est imperfectus, ne credere posset aliquis, quod Dei Filius esset imperfectus semper,[4] ideo decreverunt dici *semper genitus*.

The other reason is, that we do understand the Divine Generation by being in a certain sense led in the dark [manductione quadam] through the generation, which is around us; and because we see in this generation, that one begotten, while he is generated, is imperfect, lest anyone might [posset] believe, that the Son of God be always imperfect,[4] for that reason they decided that He be called the *always born*.

Dicendum ergo, quod quantum est ex parte rei, aeque vere ac proprie dicitur unum, sicut religuum. Quod vero dicit Gregorius, dicit quantum ad maiorem fidei explanationem, ne error habeat locum; et sic exponit Magister.[5] Magis ergo convenit dicere: semper genitus, quam semper generatur. Nec est simile de hoc verbo *est* et *fuit*; quia hoc verbum *est* significat per modum quietis, et ideo *esse*, dum est, perfectum est; sed hoc verbum *generari* penes haec inferiora per modum *fieri*; et[6] quia in pluribus hoc verum est, quod aliquid, dum fit, non habet esse perfectum, ideo non est simile secundum rationem intelligentiae.

It must be therefore said, that as much as it is on the part of the thing, one (thing) is in an equally true and proper manner said, just as the rest. On the other hand, what (St.) Gregory says, he says as much as regards the greater explanation of the Faith, lest error have a place; and in this manner Master (Peter) expounds it.[5] It is fitting, therefore, that one rather say: always born, than He is always generated. Nor is it similar concerning this verb *is* and *was*; because this verb *is* signifies through a manner of rest, and therefore "being" [esse], while it is, is perfect; but this verb *to be generated*, in accord with the following determinations [penes haec inferiora], (signifies) through a manner of *becoming* [fieri]; and[6] because in many this is true, for that reason it is not similar according the reckoning of the intelligence.

Dub. VI.

Doubt VI

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Ego hodie genui te*, quia potest intelligi de die, quo ex

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *I today have begotten Thee*, because

matre natus est; sed hoc nihil videtur valere, quia secundum hanc generationem non habuit patrem, sed tantum matrem.[7]

it can be understood of the day, on which He was born of His Mother [ex matre]; but in this nothing seems to be valid, because according to this generation He did not have a father, but only a mother.[7]

R**ESPONDEO**: Dicendum, quod illud verbum intelligendum est *causaliter*; secundum enim generationem ex matre dicitur *genuisse*, quia fecit generari. Similis est expositio super illud Matthaei tertio:[8] *Potens est de lapidibus illis suscitare filios Abrahae*; Glossa: « In huius rei testimonium Deus de Sara genuit filium, id est, fecit generai ».

I **RESPOND**: It must be said, that that verse must be understood *causally*; for according to the generation from His mother [ex matre] He is said *to have been begotten*, because (the Father) caused Him to be generated. The exposition on that (verse) of Matthew (chapter) three is similar:[8] *He is able to raise up from those stones sons for Abraham*; the Gloss (says): « In testimony of this statement [huius rei] God begot a son from [de] Sara, that is, caused him to be generated ».

DUB. VII.

DOUBT VII

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Origenes: *Splendor autem non semel nascitur et desinit*. *Contra*: si hoc simile rectum est, videtur quod Filius non semel nascitur: ergo quaeritur, quare magis generatio Filii assimilatur splendori quam aliis rebus, maxime cum non generetur a luce splendor nisi ad praesentiam corporis obiecti? Et *praeterea*, Filius dicitur *lux*;[9] non ergo *splendor lucis*.

Likewise is asked concerning this which Origen says: *Moreover, splendor is not born once and stops*. *On the contrary*: if this simile is correct, it seems that the Son is not born once: therefore it is asked, why is the generation of the Son likened to splendor rather than to other things, most of all since splendor is not generated from light except in the presence of the body of an object [ad praesentiam corporis obiecti]? And *besides*, the Son is said to be *light*;[9] therefore not the *splendor of the light*.

R**ESPONDEO**: Dicendum, quod generatio Filii habet in se perfectam *conformitatem*, *coaeternitatem* et *aequalitatem*;[10] et quia in creatura una simul haec non possumus invenire, ideo capimus ex multis, et ideo multas illi assimilamus. Quantum ergo ad *conformitatem* similis est generationi verbi,[11] quod est proles perfecte representans illum, a quo est. Quantum ad *coaeternitatem* similis est egressui splendoris a luce, in quo est coaevitas,[12] propter lucis actualitatem. Quantum ad *aequalitatem* similis generationi viventis ex vivente, qui generat sibi aequale[13] omnimo; et sic diversimode comparatur a Sanctis. Comparat igitur Origenes ad egressum splendoris, non quantum ad *iterationis assimilationem*, sed quantum ad

I **RESPOND**: It must be said, that the generation of the Son has it itself a perfect *conformity*, *coeternity* and *equality*;[10] and because we cannot find these simultaneously in one creature, for that reason we take them from many, and for that reason we liken many to that one [illi]. Therefore, as much as regards *conformity*, it is similar to the generation of a word,[11] which is the offspring perfectly representing that, from which it is. As much as regards *coeternity*, it is similar to the egress of splendor from light [a luce], in which there is coevity,[12] on account of the actuality of light. As much as regards *equality* (it is) similar to the generation of a living out of a living, which generates an entirely equal[13] to itself; and in this manner it has been

privationem intermissionis sive interpolationis.

compared in various manners by the Saints. Therefore Origin compares it to the egress of splendor, not as much as regards the *likening of a repetition* [iterationis assimilationem], but as much as regards the *privation of an intermission* or of an interpolation.

Et nota, quod differunt *splendor*, *radius* et *lumen*, cum omnia dicant influentiam a luminoso: quia *radius* dicit emissionem secundum diametralem distantiam; *lumen*, secundum circumferentiam, utrumque[14] tamen in profundum transparentis; *splendor* dicit repercussionem ad corpus non transparens, tersum et limitatum. Sed tamen hic Origenes vocat splendorem lumen progrediens a luce.

And note, that *splendor*, *ray* and *a light* [lumen] differ, though all mean an influence from (something) luminous: because *ray* means an emission according to the diametrical distance; *a light* [lumen], according to the circumference, each[14] however into the depth of transparent (space); *splendor* means a repercussion upon a non-transparent body, cleaned and limited. But Origen, however, here calls splendor a light stepping forward from light [lumen progrediens a luce].

Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod Filius est lux; dicendum, quod lux habet in se naturam *manifestandi*; et ita respicit cognitionem et appropriatur Filio; habet in se vim *multiplicandi* sive generandi splendorem; et ita appropriatur Patri.[15]

To that, therefore, which is objected, that the Son is light; it must be said, that light has in itself a nature of *manifesting*; and thus respects cognition and is appropriated to the Son; (and) it has in itself a force of *multiplying* or of generating splendor; and thus it is appropriated to the Father.[15]

---

[1] In praeced. dist. loco paulo supra citato. Cfr. etiam hic q. 4. — Fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus post *Dicendum* superflue additum *quod*. Paulo infra cod. E *motus* pro *actus*.
[2] Vat. contra plures codd. ut A G I S T V X Z etc. cum ed. 1 *Deo*.
[3] Mss. cum ed. 1 omittunt *eam* certe supplendum.
[4] Restituimus ex mss. et ed. 1 hic non bene omissum *semper*.
[5] Hic c. 2.
[6] Supplevimus ope mss. et sex primarum edd. particulam *et*.
[7] Cod. X ultimam propositionis partem sic exhibet: *generationem pater non genuit, sed tantum mater*. Mox post *Dicendum* fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *quod*.
[8] Ver. 9, in quo textu Vulgata post *est* addit *Deus* et pro *illis* habet *istis*. Glossam vide apud Lyranum in hunc locum. — Paulo ante supplevimus ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 post *Similis* verbum *est*.
[9] Ioan. 1, 9. — In Vat. ante *praeterea* deest *Et*, quod tamen in vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1 habetur.
[10] Cod. T *coequalitatem*.
[11] Unus alterque cod. ut M Y addit *ex mente*.
[12] Praeferimus lectionem paucorum mss. ee, ff et ed. 1 *coaevitas* pro *coaeternitas*, utpote quae in se verior est.
[13] Cod. W *simile*. Paulo infra cod. V *terminationis* loco *iterationis*.

[1] In the preceding distinction, in the passage a little above the one cited. Cf. also here q. 4. — Trusting in the older manuscripts and edition 1 we have expunged after *It must be said* [Dicendum] the superfluously added *that* [quod].
[2] The Vatican text, contrary to many codices, such as A G I S T V X Z etc. together with edition 1, has *of God* [de Deo].
[3] The manuscripts together with edition 1 omit [4] We have restored from the manuscripts and edition 1 the not well omitted *always* [semper].
[5] Here in ch. 2.
[6] We have supplied with the help of the manuscripts and the six first editions the particle *and* [et].
[7] Codex X exhibits the last part of the proposition thus: *the generation a father did not beget, but only a mother*. Then after *It must be said* [Dicendum] trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted *that* [quod].
[8] Verse 9, in which text the Vulgate there is said *God is able* [Potens est Deus], and for *those* [illis] it has *those . . . of yours* [istis].
[9] John 1:9. — In the Vatican text before *besides* [praeterea] there is lacking *And* [Et], which however is had in the older manuscripts and editoin 1.
[10] Codex T has *coequality* [coaequalitatem].
[11] One or the other [alterque] codex, such as M and Y, add *out of a mind* [ex mente].
[12] We prefer the reading of a few manuscripts ee, ff

[14] In Vat. obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1, *utrinque*, et mox *transferentis* loco *trasnparentis*. Paulo infra post *coporus* duce cod. O adiecimus *non*, quae lectio et in se probatur et ex auctoritate confirmatur aliorum auctorum v. g. B. Albert., hic a. 8. et 21; Scot., II. Sent. d. 13. q. unica; Richard. a. Med. II. Sent. d. 13. a. 2. q. 1; Petr. a Tar., hic q. 4. a. 1. ad. 4 etc. — De differentia inter *lucem*, *lumen colorem* cfr. infra d. 17. p. I. q. 1. in corp.
[15] Plura de hac similitudine sumta a splendore exhibent Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 42. m. 5. a. 3, et ceteri auctores paulo supra allegati et Aegid. R., hic circa lit.

and edition 1, *coevity* [coaevitas] for *coeternity* [coaeternitas], since it is truer in in itself.
[13] Codex W has *similar* [simile]. A little below this codex V has *of a termination* [terminationis] in place of *of a repetition* [iterationis].
[14] In the Vatican text, which disagrees with the manuscripts and edition 1, there is had *on both sides* [utrinque], and then *of transferring (medium)* [transferentis] in place of *of transparent (space)* [trasparentis]. A little below this at *body* [corpus] lead by codex O we have inserted *non*, which reading is both self evident and confirmed by the authority of the other authors; Richard of Middletown, Sent., Bk. II, d. 13, q. sole; (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 4, a. 1, at n. 4 etc.. — On the difference between *light*, *a light*, *color*, cf. below d. 17, p. I, q. 1 in the body of the response.
[15] For more on this similitude taken from splendor see Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I. q. 42, m. 5, a. 3, and all the other authors just cited, and Giles the Roman, here about the text (of Master Peter).

---

p. 191

Dub. VIII.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Hilarius, quod *cum sacramento scientiae suae ex eo nascitur*. Videtur enim secundum hoc, quod Pater secundum sacramentum scientiae generat Filium: ergo scientia est ratio generandi.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Hilarius vocat hic[1] *sacramentum* sacrum secretum; dicit autem, Filium nasci cum sacramento scientiae, quia Filii generatio non tantum sacra, sed etiam secreta est, non, inquam, Deo secreta, sed nobis, quia nos eam non comprehendimus; ipse autem[2] perfecte novit eam. Ideo dicit *cum sacramento* etc.

Doubt VIII

Likewise is asked concerning this which (St.) Hilary says, that *when by the sacrament of His Knowledge He is born*. For it seems according to this, that the Father generates the Son according to a sacrament of knowledge: therefore knowledge is the reason for generating.

I respond: It must be said, that (St.) Hilary calls here[1] a *sacrament* a sacred secret; moreover he says, that the Son is born with a sacrament of knowledge, because the generation of the Son is not only sacred, but also secrete, not, I say, secret to God, but to us, because we comprehend it not; but[2] He Himself perfectly knows it. For that reason he says *with the sacrament* etc..

Dub. IX.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Quod ex vivo vivum natum est habet nativitatis perfectum sine novitate naturae*. Videtur enim falsum, quia puer nascitur de patre et matre viventibus, et tamen utrumque habet, scilicet imperfectionem et novitatem.

Doubt IX

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *because a living thing [vivum] has been born out of a living thing; it has (something) perfect belonging to its nativity without a newness of nature.* For it seems (to be) false, because a son is born of a living father and a mother, and yet it has each, namely imperfection and newness.

Respondeo: Ratio Hilarii, sicut patet per litteram sequentem,[3] intelligenda est de vivo per *essentiam*; ubi enim est vivens per essentiam, non fit ex non vivo vivens, sicut fit in vivente per *participationem*, ubi non generatur vivum ex vivo nisi per non vivum, ut patet, quia homo non generatur ex homine nisi mediante semine.

I respond: The reason of (St.) Hilary, as is clear through text that followed [sequentem],[3] is to be understood of a thing living through (its) *essence*; for where there is one living through (its) essence, one living does not come to be [fit] out of a non-living, just as happens [fit] in one living through *participation*, where there is not generated a living thing out of a living thing, except through a non-living thing, as is clear, because a human is not generated out of a human except by means of semen.

Dub. X.

Doubt X

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Neque ex derivatione, sed ex virtute nativitas est*. Videtur contrarium, quia secundum Dionysium[4] et Anselmum Pater se habet ad Filium et Spiritum sanctum, ut fons, et illi ut rivi; sed rivus est a fonte per *derivationem*.

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *And the Nativity is not out of a derivation, but out of virtue*. It seems the contrary, because according to (St.) Dionysius (the Areopagite)[4] and (St.) Anselm, the Father holds Himself to the Son and the Holy Spirit, as a spring, and to They as rivers; but a river is from [a] a spring through a *derivation*.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod nativitas, quae est per derivationem, attenditur quantum ad transmutationem aliquam circa illud quod transmutatur, et ita dicit passionem quandam, ac per hoc infirmitatem;[5] sed vivens, quod est vita, est actus purus, et ita vita pura, in qua non est infirmitas, sed pura actualitas; et ideo vult Hilarius dicere, quod Pater generans est totus[6] vita, et quod generat non est per passionem vel demutationem, quae attenditur in derivatione, sed per omnimodam virtutem: ergo Filius genitus est virtus, non per mutationem natus.

I respond: It must be said, that a nativity, which is through a derivation, is attained as much as regards some transmutation about that which is transmuted, and thus it means a certain passion, and through this infirmity;[5] but One living, because He is life, is pure Act, and thus pure Life, in which there is not infirmity, but pure Actuality; and for that reason (St.) Hilary wants to say, that the Father generating is whole[6] according to life [totus vita], and what He generates is not through the passion and/or demutation [demutationem], which is attained in derivation, but through an omnimodal virtue: therefore the Son has been begotten as virtue, not born through a demutation.

Dub. XI.

Doubt XI

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Ubi Pater auctor est, ibi et nativitas est*. Videtur quod improprie dicit,[7] quia *auctoritas* dicit causalitatem; sed haec non recipitur in divinis: ergo etc.

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *Where the Father is author, There there is also a nativity.* It seems that he speaks improperly,[7] because *authority* means causality; but this is not received among divine things: ergo etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *auctoritas* dicit quandam principalitatem sive auctoritatem in persona, quae nihil habet ab alio, sed ab ipso omnes; et ista auctoritas in Patre est innascibilitas; unde non dicit causalitatem, sed privationem principii, et per hoc summam principalitatem.[8]

I respond: It must be said, that *authority* means a certain principality or authority in person, which has nothing from another, but all from it; and this authority in the Father is innascibility; whence it does not mean causality, but privation of principle, and through this a most high principality.[8]

Dub. XII.

Doubt XII

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Quod vero ab aeterno natum est, id, si non aeternum natum est* etc.; et innuit Hilarius hic tale argumentum: si Filius non est generatus sive natus ab aeterno, generatio eius non est aeterna; et si hoc,[9] Pater non generat ab aeterno: ergo Pater non est aeternus: ergo qui derogat aeternitati Filii, derogat aeternitati Patris. *Sed* ista ratio non videtur valere, quia similiter ego arguam ex parte Creatoris et creaturae: si[10] creatura non est aeterna, non ab aeterno creavit Deus, et ita non est Creator aeternus.

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *On the other hand, because it has been born out of an eternal, on that account, if there is not an eternal born* etc.; and (St.) Hilary hints here at such an argument: if the Son has not been generated or born from an eternal, His generation is not eternal; and if this,[9] (then) the Father does not generated from an eternal: therefore the Father is not eternal: therefore who derogates from the eternity of the Son, derogates from the eternity of the Father. *But* this reckoning of his does not seem to be valid, because I may similarly argue on the part of the Creator and creature: if[10] a creature is not eternal, God has not created it from an eternal, and thus there is not an eternal Creator.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod non est simile, sicut patet ex sequenti[11] eius quod Hilarius supponit, quod esse Patrem sit proprie proprium illius personae: ergo cum tale semper conveniat, aut aliter res non habet esse perfectum, sequitur de necessitate: aut Filius est aeternus, aut Pater ab aeterno non habet esse perfectum. Creare vero, etsi solius Dei sit, tamen ratione connotati habet imperfectionem coniunctam, secundum quam non tantum impossibile, sed etiam non intelligibile est, aliquid ab aeterno creari.[12]

I respond: It must be said, that it is not similar, just as is clear from his following (argument)[11] which (St.) Hilary supposes, that to be the Father is properly proper to that Person: therefore since such is always befitting [conveniat], either the thing does not otherwise have a perfect 'being' [esse perfectum], there follows from necessity: either the Son is eternal, or the Father from eternity [ab aeterno] does not have a perfect being [esse perfectum]. On the other hand, to create, even if it belongs to God alone, nevertheless by a reckoning of what is connoted [connotati] it has imperfection conjoined (to it), according to which it is not only impossible, but also non-intelligible, that something be created from eternity [ab aeterno].[12]

Dub. XIII.

Doubt XIII

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *Sed se ipsum demutare nascendo*; quia secundum

Likewise is asked concerning this which he says: *But to demutate one's very self by*

hoc, cum Filius Dei prius esset et postea ex Virgine natus sit:[13] ergo esset mutatus.

being born; because according to this, since the Son of God was born before, and afterwards was born of the Virgine:[13] therefore He would have changed [esset mutatus].

[1] Vat. contra plurimos codd. et ed. 1 minus bene *hoc*.
[2] Aliqui codd. ut A I T Z bb cc *enim*; ed. 1 *vero*.
[3] Quae Hilarii verba vide in lit. Magistri c. 4. post medium. — Mox plures codd. ut F H I T X Y Z etc. cum ed. 1 *intelligitur* loco *intelligenda est*. [Tr. — hic in ed. criticali deest italicizatione in *est*.]
[4] De Div. Nom. c. 2. § 5: Pater fons in supersubstantiali Dietate. Anselm, de Fide Trin. c. 8. et de Process. Spiritus S. c. 17, ubi haec similitudo fuse exponitur.
[5] Multi codd. ut A C F G H I K L R S T U V etc. cum subnexis non cohaerenter *informitatem*.
[6] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 minus apte *tota*. Mox cod. M *ita quod* pro *et quod*. Paulo infra post *demutationem* in Vat. additur *seu deminutionem*, quod abest ab antiquis mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3.
[7] Vat. *dicat*. Mox cod. Y *reperitur* loco *recipitur*.
[8] Cod. Z addit *sive auctoritatem*.
[9] In cod. M additur *ergo*.
[10] Fide codd. F T Y substituimus *si* pro *sed*. Mox verbis *ab aeterno* codd. W X Y cum ed. 1 praemittunt *ergo*, Vat. cum aliquibus mss. *enim*; cod. H ponit *quia non ab aeterno*; multi codd. ut A F G T V etc. quamlibet particulam omittunt.
[11] Cod. W *consequenti*.
[12] De quo vide II. Sent. d. 1. p. I. a. 1. q. 2.
[13] Vat. cum ed. 1, mutata interpunctione, *sic*, at codd. A F G H I K T etc. exhibent textum nostrum.

[1] The Vatican text, contrary to very many codices and edition 1, less well has *this* [hoc].
[2] Some codices, such as A I T Z bb and cc, have *form* [enim]; edition 1 has *however* [vero].
[3] Which words of (St.) Hilary are found in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 4, after the middle. — Then very many codices, such as F H I T X Y Z etc., together with edition 1, have *is understood* [intelligitur] in place of *is to be understood* [intelligenda est].
[4] On the Divine Names, ch. 2, § 5: The Father, the Spring in the supersubstantial Deity. (St.) Anselm, On Faith in the Trinity, ch. 8, and On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, ch. 17, where this similitude is expounded at length.
[5] Many codices, such as A C F G H I K L R S T U V etc., have, not coherently with what is subjoined, *informity* [informitatem].
[6] The Vatican text, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, has the less apt *all life* [tota vita]. Then codex M has *thus what* [ita quod] in place of *and what* [et quod]. A little below this after *demutation* there is added in the Vatican text *or diminuation* [deminutionem], which is absent from the ancient manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3.
[7] The Vatican text has the subjunctive *says* [dicat]. Then codex Y has *is found* [reperitur] in place of *is received* [recipitur].
[8] Codex Z adds *or authority* [seu auctoriatem].
[9] In codex M there is added *therefore* [ergo].
[10] Trusting in codices F T and Y we have substituted *if* [si] for *but* [sed]. Then to the words *God did not create from eternity* [ab aeterno creavit Deus] codices W X and Y together with ed. 1 add *therefore* [ergo], the Vatican text with some of the manuscripts adds *for* [enim]; codex H as *because God did not create* etc. [quia non ab aeterno etc]; many codices, such as A F G T V etc. omit one particle or another.
[11] Codex W has *consequent (argument)* [consequenti].
[12] Concerning which see Sent., Bk. II, d. 1, p. I, a. 1, q. 2.
[13] The Vatican text together with edition 1, having changed the punctuation, has *afterwards born of the Virgin in this manner* [postea ex Virigine natus sic], but codices A F G H I K T etc. exhibit our text.

p. 192

R**ESPONDEO**: Dicendum, quod ipse[1] Hilarius intelligit secundum *eandem* naturam, secundum quam prius erat. Si enim

I **RESPOND**: It must be said, that (St.) Hilary himself[1] understands (it) according to the *same* Nature, according to which He was

secundum eandem naturam prius erat et postea natus est, necesse est, quod secundum illam naturam mutatus sit; sed si secundum *aliam*,[2] oportet mutationem fieri in illa natura, sed non in persona, cum illa natura non dicat aliquid *in* persona, sed magis aliquid *cum* persona. Unde nulla fit mutatio in alia[3] natura.

before. For if according to the same Nature He was before and afterwards He was born, it is necessary, that according to that Nature He be changed; but if according to *the other*,[2] it is proper that a mutation come to be in that nature, but not in the Person, since that nature does not mean anything *in* the Person, but rather something *with* the Person. Whence no mutation comes to be in the other[3] Nature.

[1] In Vat. desideratur *ipse*, quod in mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6, habetur.
[2] Vat. cum cod. cc repetit hic *naturam*, quod deest in antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1. Paulo infra post *persona* adiungunt aliqui codd. ut I T *est*.
[3] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 loco *illa* posuimus *alia*, sub qua intellige divinam naturam.

[1] In the Vatican text there is wanting *himself* [ipse], which is had in the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6.
[2] The Vatican text together with codex cc here repeats the *nature* [naturam], which is lacking in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1. A little below this at *not in the Person* [non in persona] some codices, such as I and T, add *it is* [est].
[3] Trusting in many manuscripts and edition 1 in place of *that* [illa] we have put *the other* [aliam], by which one understands the Divine Nature.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.